Proceedings of the 3rd Eastern Scotian Shelf Integrated Management (ESSIM) Forum Workshop, Halifax, Nova Scotia, 22–23 February 2005

S. Coffen-Smout, D. Millar, G. Herbert, and T. Hall (Editors)

Oceans and Habitat Branch
Maritimes Region
Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Bedford Institute of Oceanography
Dartmouth, Nova Scotia B2Y 4A2

2005

Canadian Manuscript Report of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 2719

Fisheries and Oceans Canada | Pêches et Océans Canada

Canada

Canadian Manuscript Report of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences

Manuscript reports contain scientific and technical information that contributes to existing knowledge but which deals with national or regional problems. Distribution is restricted to institutions or individuals located in particular regions of Canada. However, no restriction is placed on subject matter, and the series reflects the broad interests and policies of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, namely, fisheries and aquatic sciences.

Manuscript reports may be cited as full publications. The correct citation appears above the abstract of each report. Each report is abstracted in *Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Abstracts* and indexed in the Department's annual index to scientific and technical publications.

Numbers 1–900 in this series were issued as Manuscript Reports (Biological Series) of the Biological Board of Canada, and subsequent to 1937 when the name of the Board was changed by Act of Parliament, as Manuscript Reports (Biological Series) of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada. Numbers 901–1425 were issued as Manuscript Reports of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada. Numbers 1426–1550 were issued as Department of Fisheries and the Environment, Fisheries and Marine Service Manuscript Reports. The current series name was changed with report number 1551.

Manuscript reports are produced regionally but are numbered nationally. Requests for individual reports will be filled by the issuing establishment listed on the front cover and title page. Out-of-stock reports will be supplied for a fee by commercial agents.

Rapport manuscrit canadien des sciences halieutiques et aquatiques

Les rapports manuscrits contiennent des renseignements scientifiques et techniques qui constituent une contribution aux connaissances actuelles, mais qui traitent de problèmes nationaux or régionaux. La distribution en est limitée aux organismes et aux personnes de régions particulières du Canada. Il n'y a aucune restriction quant au sujet; de fait, la série reflète la vaste gamme des intérêts et des politiques du ministère des Pêches et des Océans, c'est-à-dire les sciences halieutiques et aquatiques.

Les rapports manuscrits peuvent être cités comme des publications complètes. Le titre exact paraît au-dessus du résumé de chaque rapport. Les rapports manuscrits sont résumés dans la revue *Résumés des sciences aquatiques et halieutiques*, et ils sont classés dans l'index annuel des publications scientifiques et techniques du Ministère.

Les numéros 1 à 900 de cette série ont été publiés à titre de manuscrits (série biologique) de l'Office de biologie du Canada, et après le changement de la désignation de cet organisme par décret du Parlement, en 1937, ont été classés comme manuscrits (série biologique) de l'Office des recherches sur les pêcheries du Canada. Les numéros 901 à 1425 ont été publiés à titre de rapports manuscrits de l'Office des recherches sur les pêcheries du Canada. Les numéros 1426 à 1550 sont parus à titre de rapports manuscrits du Service des pêches et de la mer, ministère des Pêches et de l'Environnement. Le nom actuel de la série a été établi lors de la parution du numéro 1551.

Les rapports manuscrits sont produits à l'échelon régional, mais numérotés à l'échelon national. Les demandes de rapports seront satisfaites par l'établissement auteur dont le nom figure sur la couverture et la page du titre. Les rapports épuisés seront fournis contre rétribution par des agents commerciaux.

105-06120/

Canadian Manuscript Report of
Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 2719

2005

PROCEEDINGS OF THE 3rd EASTERN SCOTIAN SHELF INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT (ESSIM) FORUM WORKSHOP, HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA, 22–23 FEBRUARY 2005

Edited by

S. Coffen-Smout, D. Millar, G. Herbert, and T. Hall

ESSIM Planning Office
Oceans and Coastal Management Division
Oceans and Habitat Branch
Maritimes Region
Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Bedford Institute of Oceanography
PO Box 1006
Dartmouth, Nova Scotia B2Y 4A2

© Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, 2005,
as represented by the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans.
Cat. No. Fs 97-4/2719E ISSN 0706-6473

Correct citation for this publication:

S. Coffen-Smout, D. Millar, G. Herbert, and T. Hall (eds.), 2005. Proceedings of the 3rd Eastern Scotian Shelf Integrated Management (ESSIM) Forum Workshop, Halifax, Nova Scotia, 22–23 February 2005, Can. Manuscr. Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 2719: viii + 63 pp.

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY iv
RÉSUMÉ vi

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS viii

1.0 INTRODUCTION 1

2.0 WORKSHOP PRESENTATIONS AND SMALL-GROUP DISCUSSIONS 2
Overview of Draft Integrated Ocean Management Plan 2
Small-Group Discussion of Vision, Scope of the Plan, and Planning Area 5
Overview of the Ecosystem Objectives 6
Overview of the Human Use Objectives 7
Small-Group Discussion of Decision Rules 10
Overview of the Collaborative Planning Model 12
Plenary Panel on the Collaborative Planning Model 16
Small-Group Discussion on the Collaborative Planning Model 26
Overview of the Coral Conservation Plan 28
Overview of the ESSIM Planning Office Work Plan, 2005–2006 29
Small-Group Discussion on Action Planning 31

3.0 FINAL PLENARY DISCUSSION 33

4.0 SYNTHESIS OF ESSIM RESPONSE SURVEYS 37

5.0 NEXT STEPS 39

APPENDIX I: AGENDA 40
APPENDIX II: WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS AND INVITED PERSONS 42
APPENDIX III: INTRODUCTORY SPEECHES 46
APPENDIX IV: PRESENTATION ABSTRACTS 49
APPENDIX V: CONSOLIDATED NOTES FROM SMALL GROUPS 55
APPENDIX VI: ESSIM-RELATED PUBLICATIONS 62

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Eastern Scotian Shelf Integrated Management (ESSIM) Initiative is a collaborative planning process for the Eastern Scotian Shelf planning area. The development of an integrated ocean management plan for this large marine area involves a broad range of interests, including government, aboriginal communities, ocean industry and resource users, environmental interest groups, coastal communities, and university researchers. In February 2005, the ESSIM Planning Office, Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO Maritimes Region) released a draft integrated ocean management plan based on input received from two major multi-stakeholder workshops, a series of smaller workshops and meetings, online discussions, and a number of multi-sectoral working group processes. To promote dialogue and solicit feedback on key elements of the draft ESSIM plan, DFO hosted the 3rd ESSIM Forum Workshop in Halifax, Nova Scotia, at Mount St. Vincent University, on 22–23 February 2005. Approximately 160 participants from a broad range of ocean interests attended the workshop to discuss key elements of the ESSIM plan, including the scope and vision, the objectives-based management framework, the collaborative planning model, and proposed management strategies and actions.

The workshop format consisted of plenary presentations, open microphone sessions, a panel discussion, and four small-group discussion sessions. These workshop proceedings are based on the consolidation team's summaries of the small-group discussions, audio recordings, and notes submitted by presenters. The proceedings are intended to capture key points raised at the workshop, but may not include full details of all discussions. More detailed records from the small-group discussions, such as facilitators' notes, flip charts, and written comments submitted by participants, are being reviewed by the Planning Office and will be fully considered in the revision of the plan.

A broad range of comments was received on the plan elements and the process for plan implementation and approval. Despite the diversity of comments noted, there was general support and acceptance of the directions outlined in the plan and an expressed desire for action on the objectives-based management framework, the Stakeholder Roundtable, the Regional Committee on Ocean Management, and the various management strategies and actions. That recognition serves as a solid basis for DFO to move forward on several next steps.

The 3rd ESSIM Forum Workshop represented the first step in the review process for the draft ESSIM plan. The next step in the process is to release the plan for further stakeholder and public review. In order to facilitate the review process, the ESSIM Planning Office will be developing a simplified overview of the plan that presents key components in a more readable format. The Planning Office will also be working towards the development of an initial Action Plan that will provide additional details on management strategies and actions outlined in the draft plan.

The formal review period for the draft plan will begin in May 2005, at which time the Planning Office will be distributing consultation materials to stakeholder groups and the broader public. Interested groups and individuals will be invited to provide input on the plan through written submissions, meetings with the Planning Office, and community workshops and public meetings planned for the fall of 2005. Any group or individual interested in discussing the plan is welcome to contact the Planning Office at any time to arrange a meeting.

During the spring and summer of 2005, the Planning Office will be working on the establishment of the Stakeholder Roundtable, a key component of the ESSIM Collaborative Planning Model. Letters will be issued to stakeholder networks in the near future soliciting nominations for Roundtable representatives. It is anticipated that an initial meeting of the Stakeholder Roundtable will be scheduled for September 2005. This meeting will predominantly focus on the process for the Stakeholder Roundtable, with another meeting to be scheduled for later in the year to review and further develop the draft plan.

Formal public review activities for the draft plan are slated to conclude by October 31st 2005, although the ESSIM Planning Office will continue to accept feedback on an ongoing basis. After the review is complete, the Planning Office will revise the plan in accordance with the input received and prepare a final draft for distribution. Based on the response to the revised draft, the Planning Office will endeavour to have the plan endorsed by all sectors and approved under the *Oceans Act* in 2006.

RÉSUMÉ

L'initiative de Gestion intégrée de l'est du plateau néo-écossais (GIEPNE) est un processus coopératif de planification de la zone est du plateau néo-écossais. L'élaboration d'un plan de gestion intégrée de l'océan dans cette vaste zone maritime fait appel à un grand éventail de secteurs d'intérêt, notamment au gouvernement, aux collectivités autochtones, aux industries maritimes et aux utilisateurs des ressources maritimes, aux groupes qui s'intéressent à l'environnement, aux collectivités côtières et aux chercheurs universitaires. En février 2005, le Bureau de planification de la GIEPNE à Pêches et Océans Canada (Région des Maritimes) a rendu publique une ébauche de plan de gestion intégrée de l'océan, fondée sur les opinions formulées dans le cadre de deux grands ateliers multipartites, d'une série de plus petits ateliers et réunions, de discussions en direct et de rencontres de divers groupes de travail multisectoriels. Pour promouvoir le dialogue et solliciter des commentaires sur les principaux éléments de l'ébauche du plan de GIEPNE, le MPO a tenu le troisième atelier du Forum de la GIEPNE à l'Université Mount St. Vincent d'Halifax (Nouvelle-Écosse) les 22 et 23 février 2005. Environ 160 participants, venant de multiples secteurs du domaine maritime, ont assisté à cet atelier, qui avait pour but de discuter des aspects essentiels du plan de GIEPNE, notamment de sa portée et de sa vision, du cadre de gestion par objectifs, du modèle coopératif de planification ainsi que des stratégies et mesures de gestion proposées.

L'atelier se composait de présentations en séances plénières, de discussions à micro ouvert, d'un débat de spécialistes et de quatre séances de discussion en petits groupes. Le compte-rendu de l'atelier est fondé sur la synthèse des discussions en petits groupes, sur les enregistrements des débats et sur les notes soumises par les auteurs de présentations. Il a pour but de rendre compte des principaux points soulevés à l'atelier, mais ne comprend pas nécessairement le détail de toutes les discussions. Le Bureau de planification examine l'information détaillée provenant des discussions en petits groupes, comme les notes des animateurs, les feuilles des tableaux de papier et les commentaires écrits soumis par les participants, pour qu'il en soit pleinement tenu compte dans la version révisée du plan.

Les éléments du plan et le processus de mise en œuvre et d'approbation de celui-ci ont suscité des commentaires très divers, d'où se dégageait néanmoins une acceptation générale des orientations contenues dans le plan et l'expression du désir de mettre en œuvre le cadre de gestion par objectifs, la table ronde des intervenants, le comité régional de gestion de l'océan et les diverses stratégies et mesures de gestion. Cette acceptation représente une base solide sur laquelle le MPO pourra prendre appui pour passer aux prochaines étapes.

Le troisième Forum de la GIEPNE représentait la première étape du processus d'examen de l'ébauche du plan de GIEPNE. La prochaine étape consistera à soumettre le plan à un plus ample examen des intervenants et du public. Pour faciliter le processus d'examen, le Bureau de planification de la GIEPNE produira un aperçu simplifié du plan, qui présentera les éléments essentiels de ce dernier sous une forme mieux lisible. Le Bureau de planification travaillera aussi à l'élaboration d'un plan d'action initial, qui fournira des renseignements supplémentaires sur les stratégies et mesures de gestion décrites dans l'ébauche de plan.

La période d'examen officiel de l'ébauche de plan débutera en mai 2005. Le Bureau de planification diffusera alors les documents de consultation aux groupes d'intervenants et au grand public. Les groupes intéressés et les particuliers seront invités à faire connaître leur avis sur le plan par écrit ou encore dans le cadre de réunions avec le Bureau de planification, d'ateliers communautaires et de réunions publiques prévues pour l'automne 2005. Tout groupe ou particulier qui souhaite discuter du plan peut communiquer avec le Bureau de planification quand il le désire pour organiser une réunion.

Au cours du printemps et l'été 2005, le Bureau de planification entreprendra les démarches afin de mettre sur pied une table ronde des intervenants, un élément clé du Modèle de planification en collaboration GIEPNE. Des lettres seront envoyées prochainement aux réseaux d'intervenants pour solliciter la nomination de représentants à la table ronde. On s'attend à pouvoir convoquer une première réunion de la table des intervenants en septembre 2005. Cette réunion portera surtout sur le processus d'implantation de la table. Une autre réunion aura lieu plus tard dans l'année pour examiner et améliorer l'ébauche de plan.

On prévoit que les activités d'examen public officiel de l'ébauche du plan seront terminées d'ici le 31 octobre 2005, quoique le Bureau de planification de la GIEPNE continuera ensuite d'accepter les commentaires. Une fois l'examen terminé, le Bureau de planification modifiera le plan en fonction des opinions formulées et il en établira une ébauche définitive, aux fins de diffusion. Selon la réaction que suscitera l'ébauche modifiée, le Bureau de planification cherchera à faire avaliser le plan par tous les secteurs et à le faire approuver en vertu de la *Loi sur les océans* en 2006.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The ESSIM Planning Office would like to thank all workshop participants and organizers, as the interest, input and energy made the workshop a success. We also would like to thank the multi-sector ESSIM Forum Workshop Planning Team, which played an integral role in designing the workshop format and agenda. The Workshop Planning Team included representatives from the following organizations: An Cala Consulting; BLSmith Groupwork Inc.; Canada-Nova Scotia Offshore Petroleum Board; the Ecology Action Centre; Jacques Whitford; Marine Affairs Program, Dalhousie University; Nova Scotia Department of Energy; Seafood Producers' Association of Nova Scotia; and World Wildlife Fund Canada.

The facilitated small-group discussion sessions were a key mechanism for stakeholder dialogue and input at the workshop. Thanks to Bruce Smith, the Workshop Facilitator, and his dedicated team of facilitators and reporters for assisting with these sessions:

Jacinta Berthier (Dalhousie Marine Affairs Program)
Kim Doane (Nova Scotia Department of Energy)
Beverley Grant (DFO Oceans and Habitat)
Melanie Hurlburt (Dalhousie Marine Affairs Program)
Justin Huston (Nova Scotia Department of Agriculture and Fisheries)
Cathy Merriman (WWF Canada)
Gerard Peters (DFO Policy and Economics)
Karen Traversy (An Cala Consulting)
Jennifer Voutier (Dalhousie Marine Affairs Program)
Gabrielle Wint-Rose (Dalhousie Marine Affairs Program)
Danny Walmsley (Walmsley Environmental)
Jay Walmsley (Jacques Whitford)
Tana Worcester (DFO Science)

And staff from the Oceans and Coastal Management Division who assisted in planning, preparation, and facilitation of the workshop:

Debi Campbell
Penny Doherty
Derek Fenton
Paul Macnab
Melissa McDonald
Bob St-Laurent
Celeine Renaud
Cynthia Thornham
Maxine Westhead

The Planning Office would also like to thank the people who assisted in the preparation of this workshop report.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Eastern Scotian Shelf Integrated Management (ESSIM) Initiative is a collaborative planning process for the Eastern Scotian Shelf planning area. The development of an integrated ocean management plan for this large marine area involves a broad range of interests, including government, aboriginal communities, ocean industry and resource users, environmental interest groups, coastal communities, and university researchers. In February 2005, the ESSIM Planning Office released a draft integrated ocean management plan based on input received from two major multi-stakeholder workshops, a series of smaller workshops and meetings, online discussions, and a number of multi-sectoral working group processes. To promote dialogue and solicit feedback on key elements of the draft plan, Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) hosted the 3rd ESSIM Forum Workshop in Halifax, Nova Scotia, at Mount St. Vincent University, on 22–23 February 2005 (see Agenda in Appendix I). A multi-sectoral planning team assisted DFO in the workshop design and agenda. Approximately 160 participants (see Appendix II) from a broad range of ocean interests attended the workshop to discuss key elements of the ESSIM plan, including the scope and vision, the objectives-based management framework, the collaborative planning model, and proposed management strategies and actions.

Introductory comments were provided by Carol Ann Rose, Regional Director (Acting), Oceans and Habitat Branch, and Neil Bellefontaine, Regional Director-General, DFO Maritimes Region (see Appendix III). The workshop format consisted of plenary presentations, open microphone sessions, a panel discussion, and four small-group discussion sessions. Workshop participants were assigned to multi-sectoral tables for the discussions, each of which had a facilitator/reporter. Participants were rotated on the second day to tables with different facilitators and participants. After each session, the facilitators worked with a consolidation team to record outcomes of the discussions (see the Consolidated Notes in Appendix V). Printed summaries of the outcomes were presented back to workshop participants for comment. These workshop proceedings are based on the consolidation team's summaries, audio recordings, and notes submitted by presenters. The proceedings are intended to capture key points raised at the workshop, but may not include full details of all discussions. More detailed records from the small-group discussions, such as facilitators' notes, flip charts, and written comments submitted by participants, are being reviewed by the Planning Office and will be fully considered in the revision of the plan.

In addition to summaries of the small-group discussions, these proceedings include abstracts of presentations delivered at the workshop (see Appendix IV), transcripts of open microphone sessions, and results of the workshop evaluations. In most cases, the text from plenary sessions is near verbatim transcription of the audio recordings, with some minor editing for readability and clarity.

References to ESSIM-related publications are listed in Appendix VI. To obtain more information on the ESSIM Initiative or to provide feedback on this workshop report, please contact:

ESSIM Planning Office
Oceans and Coastal Management Division
Fisheries and Oceans Canada (Maritimes Region)
Bedford Institute of Oceanography
PO Box 1006
Dartmouth, Nova Scotia B2Y 4A2
Tel: 902 426-2009
Fax: 902 426-3855
E-mail: essim@mar.dfo-mpo.gc.ca
http://www.mar.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/oceans/

2.0 WORKSHOP PRESENTATIONS AND SMALL-GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Overview of the Draft Integrated Ocean Management Plan

Glen Herbert, Oceans and Coastal Management Division, DFO Maritimes Region

Since the last Forum Workshop in 2003, significant progress has been made within the ESSIM Initiative, culminating in the development of a draft Integrated Ocean Management Plan. The draft is a multi-year, strategic-level plan, intended to provide long-term direction and a common basis for integrated, ecosystem-based and adaptive management of all marine activities on or affecting the Eastern Scotian Shelf. The plan reflects work to date such as the Strategic Planning Framework presented in 2003, the Collaborative Planning Model released in 2004, and the human use and ecosystem objectives developed over the last two years by a multi-stakeholder working group. The plan is a working document designed to solicit feedback from all sectors and will be revised as necessary to reflect stakeholder input.

The focus and scope of the plan are captured by three overarching themes – multiple human use, marine ecosystem-based management and conservation, and collaborative planning and management coordination. These themes are intended to capture all issues that fall under the purview of integrated management, ranging from access to ocean space and resources, to conservation issues faced in the region, to the needs related to collaborative planning, management, and policy coordination.

The legislative and policy basis for the plan is in the *Oceans Act*, *Canada's Oceans Strategy*, and the *National Policy and Operational Framework for Integrated Management*, all of which direct Canada towards the establishment and implementation of integrated management plans. The recently released *Oceans Action Plan* also supports the implementation of integrated management.

Although the plan is currently focused on the offshore portions of the Eastern Scotian Shelf, it does discuss the need to consider the coastal context, as well as the potential for future changes to the boundary of the planning area. The goal is to define a planning area that is practical from an ecological, human use and management perspective and that coincides with the national approach to implementing integrated management through Large Ocean Management Areas.

One of the core principles of the ESSIM process is collaboration. The plan emphasizes the fundamental importance of multi-stakeholder collaborative planning, whereby the work is done together by all communities of interest. At the same time, it recognizes and respects existing management jurisdictions and authorities held by federal, provincial and other levels of government. This can be achieved by effectively linking sector-based management systems to a common set of objectives, actions, and desired outcomes. The collaborative planning model has been designed to support these needs.

The plan is designed primarily around an objectives-based management framework. This is a hierarchical system of management objectives, comprised of high-level objectives, key elements of each high-level objective, and a more detailed set of operational objectives for each element. Both human use and ecosystem objectives are put forward in the plan, along with a set of decision-rules for integrating the two. The aim is to link specific management strategies and actions to these objectives, as well as to continually monitor our progress in terms of outcomes "on the water" and implementation of the plan.

The plan also supports area-based management, which is designed to allow management at the most appropriate spatial scale. Through integrated management, we need to review existing spatial management measures and see where we can find ways to improve and innovate. This may include the continued development of geospatial risk assessment tools, ecosystem modeling techniques, and the identification and management of ecologically significant areas.

Although the plan is not regulatory-based, effective integrated management will require the use of various regulatory tools, implemented by the responsible management authorities. The main goal is to ensure that sector-specific regulatory tools are coordinated within a broader context. There is also a range of non-regulatory tools that can be used, such as industry codes of practice, compliance promotion, and improved communications and information sharing.

The draft plan includes a set of 14 management strategies organized around the three thematic areas. Each strategy is supported by more specific management actions, for which lead and supporting organizations, timelines and status are indicated. Linkages to ecosystem and human use elements and objectives are also identified. This is a critical piece of the plan in that it sets the direction for implementation and it is the place where everyone can affirm their commitment. Some of the strategies and actions have already been initiated, but the plan links them to agreed-upon objectives and allows them to be considered comprehensively.

The final section of the draft plan deals with implementation, monitoring and review. Prior to implementation, the plan needs to be accepted by all stakeholders, endorsed by all governing authorities, and approved under the *Oceans Act*. The use of shorter term action plans is proposed as a key tool for plan implementation, to allow for effective prioritization, performance monitoring, and adaptation. A 5-year review is proposed for the plan itself.

Discussion at the 3rd Forum Workshop represents the first step in taking the plan forward. The planning office intends to continue discussion on the draft over the next few months through various mechanisms. The Planning Office would like to move forward with the Collaborative Planning Model, specifically the Stakeholder Roundtable and the senior intergovernmental committee. A revised plan is expected to be released during the fall of 2005, reflecting input from the workshop and beyond, hopefully leading to designation as Canada's first integrated management plan under the *Oceans Act* by February 2006.

Q&A Session on the ESSIM Plan Overview

Mark Butler (Ecology Action Centre): I'm interested in how the process underway to develop a benthic habitat classification scheme fits with ESSIM. Neil mentioned in his speech (See Appendix III) that this habitat classification scheme was close to being finalized, I'm glad to hear that because we need it and I think it's been almost 4 years. I'm not so happy to hear that because the involvement of outside groups like ourselves or industry has been patchy, and as far as I know there has been no discussion at all about how this habitat classification scheme will actually be applied to various activities on the shelf. In asking this question it brings up a point about how ancillary or related processes to ESSIM are integrated in ensuring that those processes also have good participation and stakeholder involvement.

Joe Arbour (DFO): Thanks Mark, excellent question. Going directly to the benthic classification, that's a very long process that we have been walking through. There were several workshops over the past 3 years or so where we talked initially about the concepts behind moving forward on developing some form of a benthic classification system for this area. And that's one where we had a lot of interplay with stakeholders and other individuals. Over the past year our Science Branch in cooperation with Natural Resources Canada started to walk through some very technical and scientific aspects of the classification system, and there were some processes that had people getting back to the workbench and scientists getting together and walking through some of the very difficult parts of coming up with a system that can start to move into the application mode. So there has been a period of scientific introspection, but that is certainly coming to a close, and there is great progress having been accomplished. Then you raise the question of how we start the process of integrating that into the ESSIM planning process. That's a next

step of this process that certainly we from the Oceans side will have a very strong role in, which will be very much a multi-stakeholder based approach. That is to say, now that we have a model that has been run through the rigour of a scientific peer review process, and we have some reliability in the information coming from it, we will start working with ocean users and stakeholders to look at how we make use of that in developing and supporting the ESSIM plan. It will play a role in the development of the ecosystem objectives and will play a clear role in assisting us in spatial risk analysis, and in looking at and relating ocean uses and their potential impact on the benthic environment. So there's a great deal of that component that we're going to move into now that we've got a reasonably well validated model to work with. That's kind of the process and the history, and our plans are over this next year to look at some workshops to bring people together to start to get a better handle on how we incorporate it into all the ESSIM planning efforts.

Mark Butler (Ecology Action Centre): Thank you, Joe, for that fairly comprehensive answer. And I appreciate that workshops are coming up but my point would be that you're suggesting that the model is now finalized, but I don't feel that there's been a lot of input outside of scientific input into that model.

Joe Arbour (DFO): As we go at this, you know that within the process we have worked with any input we get. Any ongoing input that examines the model and anything that can be done to improve the model, and input from any science source, will be openly accepted. And I shouldn't say that it is now finalized. Many people may be familiar with the Regional Advisory Process that DFO uses within Science and that's still a part of the process that has to be completed to do that peer review. It is one that is open to input from external sources and external science. I don't think the door is closed at all and it's fairly wide open in terms of input and feedback on the model.

Andre d'Entremont (Chevron Canada Resources): I am curious how this relates to other similar exercises across the Canada, since I'll be responsible for different parts of the country. Has there been very much dialogue between this particular initiative and folks at DFO that are involved in the Beaufort Sea or the Grand Banks initiatives in terms of feedback, lessons learned, so they don't have to re-invent the wheel?

Joe Arbour (DFO): There is ongoing discussion and there are people from other regions here who are involved in those integrated management projects and we have an ongoing dialogue, particularly on some of the very specific things that DFO has been developing national frameworks on, such as the whole development of ecosystem objectives. There is a whole structure of information that we collect that we compile into an ecosystem overview report and we just recently had some major workshops on comparing and contrasting how different things are being done. So there's a fairly good dialogue going on between regions and comparing lessons learned.

Valerie Bradshaw (DFO): I am wondering what is the significance of the designation stage when the plan is fairly complete or final. You said it becomes "designated".

Joe Arbour (DFO): That's a reflection that this is an activity under the *Oceans Act* and it is the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans who has the authority under the *Oceans Act* to designate this as a plan under the *Oceans Act*. That is a formality as we get towards the end of the process. In the process of developing the plan we are going to be looking really for the support of all government levels that are involved with this and a wide range of departments and ministers. The *Oceans Act* embeds the authority for designating the plan under the *Oceans Act* to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. That's a final capping off step.

Small-Group Discussion of Vision, Scope of the Plan, and Planning Area

The purpose of the first discussion session was to address broad but fundamental aspects of the ESSIM Initiative, such as its vision and goals, and to solicit general feedback on the overall structure of the ESSIM Plan. This discussion was intended to set the context for more detailed analyses of specific components of the plan in subsequent sessions. The discussion was divided into the following three topics: vision for the initiative, scope of the plan, and extent of the planning area. Groups were not expected to address all of the topics fully, but rather were given freedom to focus on the topics that they found most interesting.

Synthesis of Facilitators' Consolidated Notes

In relation to the vision, groups were asked to comment on whether the existing vision statement for ESSIM—which predominantly focuses on the planning process—should be revised to better reflect desired outcomes on the water. Some groups strongly supported such revisions, emphasizing the need to include aspirations for the people and the place in the vision as well as the process. Other groups suggested that the vision should be short and inspiring, that it should be linked to the *Oceans Action Plan*, and that it should have a clear time frame. Some participants acknowledged the importance of considering the audience for the vision, while others recommended that terms such as sustainability should be more clearly defined. On the other hand, one group felt that the existing vision was perfectly satisfactory and did not require revision.

Groups were also asked to review the goals and guiding principles for the initiative and recommend any changes that they felt should be made. Feedback on the goals emphasized the need to reflect ecosystem limits, avoid overlap between goals, and balance national, local, and regional perspectives. In regard to the principles, a number of groups suggested additional principles that they felt should be added, including: ongoing learning, adaptability, science-based, fairness and equity, partnership, stakeholder buy-in, commitment to action, accountability, education, valuation, and balance. On the other hand, one group felt that there were already too many principles, and suggested that the list be consolidated. Others suggested that the principles should be prioritized, linked to measurable outcomes, and/or be accompanied by a glossary.

In regards to the planning area, groups were asked what criteria should be used to define boundaries, whether the existing planning area should be revised, and whether any additional concerns or issues relating to the area remained unresolved. In regard to criteria, several groups felt that ecosystem boundaries should be the first consideration, and human use patterns a secondary criterion. On the other hand, an even larger number of groups felt that the planning area should be based on human use patterns first and ecosystem boundaries second. Other groups argued that political, administrative and legal criteria such as the boundaries of other integrated management initiatives, Aboriginal claims, and the location of international borders should be important considerations.

A number of comments were made on the boundaries of the existing planning area, which some groups felt were administrative, arbitrary, and fisheries biased. It was also noted that the planning area was created before the collaborative process began. There was a divergence of perspectives on whether the boundaries should be adjusted. Several groups felt that the boundaries should remain as is in order to keep the area small to maintain simplicity, while other groups felt that the area should be expanded to include inshore areas, watersheds, and/or the western shelf. Meanwhile, several groups acknowledged that human use patterns and ecosystems rarely have clear boundaries, creating potential management challenges around the edges of the planning area. In light of this challenge, a number of groups emphasized that the boundaries should be flexible and adaptable.

The final area of discussion within the first session was the structure, scope, and content of the draft ESSIM plan. Several groups expressed general satisfaction with the plan, acknowledging it as a sound framework with the potential to address the full range of management needs. Nonetheless, a variety of recommendations were made for improvements to the document. In several instances it was suggested that the plan should be made more user friendly and easier to read in order to reach a broader audience. Specifically it was recommended that the plan be broken down into smaller, more readable sections. Participants also suggested a number of components that they felt should be added or expanded, such as details of decision making and conflict resolution processes, community outreach strategies, history and background information, an explanation of the process for designation under the *Oceans Act*, and specific examples and case studies. Finally, several areas were identified around which groups felt the plan should have a stronger emphasis, including the role of the private sector, social and cultural values, and the relationship between the environment and human health.

Overview of the Ecosystem Objectives Presentation

Kees Zwanenburg, DFO Science Branch

Integrated management is intended to facilitate planning for long-term sustainable use of ecosystems. This involves at least three steps: establishing conservation objectives for components of the ecosystem that we want to maintain or restore, identifying human use objectives, and integrating these two sets of objectives. The ESSIM Science working group is focussing on formalizing the conservation objectives, identifying and formalizing the interaction between human use objectives and conservation objectives, and identifying the scientific research required to support the management of human activities within this overall conservation framework. The science working group has categorized the objectives using the national conservation objectives established at Dunsmuir: biodiversity, productivity, and habitat.[1]

Detailed worksheets are being developed to unpack (i.e., develop specific measurable objectives from conceptual objectives) each of the sub-objectives that have been identified under each of the overarching objectives. These worksheets will be used to establish, among other things, indicators and reference points, suggested management actions, and assess detailed science needs. Experts have been identified to complete each worksheet, recognizing that data may be very limited in relation to some of the objectives. Experts are encouraged to unpack each of the objectives as far as possible to maximize their utility in management decisions.

Completing these worksheets will be a significant challenge for the project both in terms of the time required from the experts and in normalizing our regional efforts with the national process. We made significant progress on the latter issue at a recent review meeting in Moncton and further meetings are planned.

Through the identification of indicators and reference points the worksheets will allow managers to measure progress towards each objective. This is problematic for components of the ecosystem that have not been well-studied and will require a prominent role for the inclusion of expert opinions until more comprehensive information and knowledge become available. Given that new knowledge will be gathered and that our understanding of the interactions between human uses and ecosystem functioning will improve it is essential that the integrated management plan be adaptable.

---

[1] DFO, 2001. Proceedings of the National Workshop on Objectives and Indicators for Ecosystem-based Management, Sidney, British Columbia, 27 February–2 March 2001. Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat Proceedings, 2001/09. http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/CSAS/Csas/Proceedings/2001/PRO2001_09e.pdf.

Some components of the ecosystem will require monitoring because they have been identified as key components, heavily influencing the composition and dynamics of the system. They may also be components that indicate response of the system to human use. The science working group has identified a set of monitoring objectives that will ensure the availability of comprehensive data from which to monitor the overall dynamics of the ecosystem over time.

The Science working group is also developing a context document that presents an overview of our current knowledge of how the ecosystem(s) of the eastern Scotian Shelf functions. The document will outline the major biophysical characteristics of the Scotian Shelf and identify the major forcing variables and structural components. Such an overview will provide the overall context within which the conservation and human use objectives can be evaluated and eventually implemented. The context document will also focus on which ecosystem components can be influenced by management decision and which cannot. It is an awareness of the latter that will dictate how expectations for use must be adapted as the system varies over time. An advanced draft of the context document will be available in March–April 2005.

The biggest challenge ahead will be integrating the conservation and human use objectives. This will require valuation and priority setting in relation to what does and does not happen in the system and how the system will or will not look in the future. This process must be informed by science, sociology, economics, and all related perspectives. We will need to look at science requirements for informing the process, including requirements for resources and personnel.

Overview of the Human Use Objectives Presentation

Jay Walmsley, Jacques Whitford Environment Limited

A multi-stakeholder working group, formed in the spring of 2003, has developed a draft framework for establishing human use objectives for the ESSIM Area. The initial framework was developed by July 2004 and then presented for broader stakeholder review at a workshop in December 2004. Based on the workshop, a revised framework with objectives and some indicators was produced in January 2005. The revised framework is now ready for review by the ESSIM Forum.

The group's aim was to develop a framework for socio-economic, cultural and institutional objectives and indicators that made sense in terms of management and reporting, and that complemented the ecosystem objectives that are being developed through a parallel process. The framework that has been proposed is hierarchical, consisting of conceptual objectives, important elements, operational objectives, and management strategies and actions. A reporting framework is also proposed, consisting of outcome indicators to monitor performance "on the water" and management indicators to monitor the implementation of management actions.

The overarching conceptual objective developed by the group for human use is "to contribute to social, cultural and economic well-being by achieving ecologically sustainable and integrated use of the ocean space and resources in the ESSIM area." The objective is based on the principles of ecological sustainability and integrated use, which the group believes should underpin all of the human use objectives. The four elements identified for the overarching objective are Community Well-Being, Economic Well-Being, Industry Capacity and Assets, and the Integrated Management Process. The following four plan-level objectives were developed for each of the elements respectively: to contribute to the long-term social and cultural well-being of communities in Nova Scotia; to generate wealth through activities related to the ocean system and distribute it according to societal objectives; to support commercial activity and other non-commercial uses within the bounds of resource capacity, while

incorporating a culture of resource stewardship; and to develop institutional arrangements and capacity and appropriate management strategies and actions that contribute to integrated ocean management. The working group felt that the integrated management objective related to both the ecosystem and human use, and that it did not necessarily fit in the same category as the other human use objectives.

Under each plan-level objective, a series of operational sub-objectives, stated as outcomes, were developed. Fact sheets were developed for each sub-objective describing their relevance to ESSIM, their relationship to other objectives, recommended outcome indicators, and potential challenges. Details of the sub-objectives are provided in a report available from the ESSIM Planning Office. Sixty-three indicators were identified for the sub-objectives, which require additional testing and revision. To make monitoring and reporting practical, a smaller list of "core indicators" should be developed. The indicators could be further developed and tested through a pilot study.

Integration of human use and ecosystem objectives is probably the biggest and most important challenge remaining. Recognition of cross-cutting issues, like the value of natural resources, may help in the integration process. Development of decision rules for integration of the two sets of objectives is also important.

There is still much work to do on the human use and ecosystem objectives, including the challenging task of implementation. All stakeholders and regulators must take responsibility for implementing the objectives if they are to be successful. This is not a task that DFO can take on alone. A shared commitment is needed.

Open Microphone Session on the Ecosystem and Human Use Objectives Presentations

Jennifer Smith (WWF Canada): What kind of opportunities for input do you see being available to people here at the Forum in the next few months on these objectives? Kees, you mentioned negotiation with stakeholders in developing the objectives. Is that something you envision happening through the Stakeholder Roundtable or more broadly in consultations?

Kees Zwanenburg (DFO): There will be an opportunity for people to participate in this process, obviously. The phase that we're in now is trying to pull together this context document and actually take two of our objective theme areas. We are having a meeting at the end of March and we are going to review this context document and try to unpack one of these particular theme areas. And my vision is that the context document and perhaps those theme unpacking documents should probably be available to the wider community for input at that point. Anybody who wants to see the list of 170 objectives and to start looking through that, you're more than welcome to. But I think it makes more sense at this next step of the process. So the answer is yes, I think.

Joe Arbour (DFO): Certainly, the whole process will be based on a highly iterative process of working with all of you in terms developing the plan, developing the objectives, and iteratively going through a review process. Part of what we'll talk about tomorrow is the next steps in how we'll go forward from this meeting in developing all of that. We'll get into more of the specific steps.

Tim Hall (DFO): I just want to add that this is really the first time that we have put these objectives to paper. Both of these groups of objectives have been developed through multi-stakeholder working groups over the last year, so they have had a lot of input and they shouldn't be all that new to people. But certainly this is the first time that they are seeing the light of day, and as part of the overall plan please put in your comments now. This is the time to do it and they are certainly all wide open, so that part is

ongoing, Jennifer, and for everybody else. So please put your comments in on the objectives as they exist at this point in time.

Bruce Chapman (Groundfish Enterprise Allocation Council): It's really a follow-up to that question and the answer to that I wanted to address. I know it's true that for the last 12 or 18 months there have been working groups on these two projects or components that would find a place in the plan ultimately. But I want to caution the people to appreciate that there may have been one or two representatives, only one or two quite literally, and if on occasion a few more, who participated in that process. I think it would be too great a burden placed on those people's shoulders to believe that they are actually representing the entire stakeholder community from which they were drawn. I very much encourage you to understand that, at least as far as the fishing industry is concerned, this is brand new. They have not seen this. They have not discussed this. And as you're taking these draft products and proceeding on in the next steps, and Kees outlined some of the work that they're doing, I very much encourage DFO and others to communicate with these stakeholders not just in parallel mechanisms like the ESSIM mechanisms or layering on new mechanisms, but in their own mechanisms in each sector. Utilize those mechanisms if you can. There is a great fatigue factor in the industry, at least some of the industry at this point, and consultation has got to be very targeted, very meaningful, for it to be useful for both stakeholders and for government as you go forward. So, on the Scotia-Fundy Roundtable specifically on fisheries, I would very much encourage you to develop a adjunct mechanism through the Scotia-Fundy Roundtable as a way of not only dealing with these two products we heard about today, but also the draft plan that you'll be going forward with. And I think you'll have a better opportunity to have some constructive input, and at the end of the day, if your goal here is to get some buy-in and some stewardship that's a better chance to do it. Thanks.

Joe Arbour (DFO): I can respond to that and I appreciate that, Bruce, absolutely. I refer to an ongoing iterative process that recognizes that we will be meeting and talking with individuals, sectors, the collectivity of everybody and utilizing existing mechanisms like the Roundtable, which is an excellent mechanism for us to be able to make contact with the fishing sector. So we will be searching out all of those mechanisms in order to work through and review the objectives and the plan in total. That is the ongoing process now that we have a draft plan that is out and this certainly is the starting point. This is sort of the introduction of this draft and this is the first shot at getting some wide-ranging input, but that whole process will continue and will involve as many people as we can make contact with.

Soonya Quon (Parks Canada): Jay, maybe you can speak to this. Kees has mentioned that there is a science advisory body that's had the first cut at the objectives. Is there a similar social science advisory body, or is there a need for such a body? What's the state of the understanding and the information sources that you have?

Jay Walmsley (Jacques Whitford): When we decided to hold the workshop in December, the idea was that it would be a regional body of experts, both sectoral experts and also experts in the socio-economic side etc. But that seemed to be more of a challenge than we could actually cope with. And we got a lot of good people there, but there were some gaps in terms of who was there. In terms of formal structures, there isn't anything at the moment.

Joe Arbour (DFO): It's a very good observation. I think we have discussed often how we draw in the social sciences, sociology, economics and various other elements that we don't have a very big wealth of in DFO. We have a very solid science base in the natural sciences. We have worked through the working group. I think that was an excellent experience. We have seen a lot of good stuff come together. It may be that your question leads us to a recommendation out of this session that says we formalize some sort of social sciences working group / steering committee that helps direct us down that path. So certainly we can take away from this meeting if that's what people feel is a good idea, and we can follow up on that.

We have avenues like the Oceans Management Research Network that has been set up that could perhaps allow us to develop that idea.

Isabel de Noronha (University of Delaware): My question is regarding merging the ecosystem objectives and human use objectives. How do you perceive you are going to merge them? Are you going to use methodologies like strategic environmental assessment? What other kinds of tools do you expect to use to merge them?

Joe Arbour (DFO): We started to look at the notion of using what we've called a rules-based approach to doing the integration. That is going to be a core bit of discussion over the next time period is looking at some of those initial ideas. Our thoughts are fairly embryonic in terms of the integration. Kees is absolutely right, this is hard stuff, and it is not going to be easy. And it is at the fundamental notion of what sustainable development and planning is all about trying to bring the balance in there. I don't think we've actually found that magic bullet yet to shoot at the problem, but that's what we hope to work towards as we discuss it today.

Kees Zwanenburg (DFO): Part of our process that we're involved in with identifying conservation objectives, once we have them in a better format, is to evaluate which of all the human use sectors and ecosystem components interact and from that we'll get a better picture of where we need to put effort. I think we have recognized that there is a lot of activity going on that you have to shoehorn into this new structure. And I think that identifying all the interactions between conservation objectives and use sectors will be the first big step that we're going to take in terms of integration. Just developing that huge matrix will be quite a task.

Small-Group Discussion of Decision Rules for Integrating Human Use and Ecosystem Objectives

The ESSIM Plan recognizes that the pursuit and implementation of ecosystem and human use objectives will lead to intersections and potential for conflict among multiple objectives. Addressing these interactions will require choices to be made and decisions to be taken. The common point between the ecosystem and human use objectives is that human use of marine space and resources places pressure on the ecosystem. Conversely, ecosystem objectives can place limits on the pursuit of human use objectives and targets. In order to address potential conflicts between ecosystem and human use objectives, four decision rules are proposed in the ESSIM Plan. The purpose of the second discussion session was to consider whether the use of decision rules is an appropriate method for addressing potential conflicts and to review the decision rules presented in the draft ESSIM plan.

Synthesis of Facilitators' Consolidated Notes

Many of the groups felt that it was essential to have rules for integrating objectives and supported the general concept of decision rules put forward in the plan. One group felt that it was too early to define decision rules and argued that the objectives should be developed further first. Several other groups felt that the term "decision rules" was too rigid, and preferred more flexible guidelines. Conversely, some participants felt that guidelines would be too weak and that rules were required. There was also more general concern that the objectives framework considers humans to be distinct from and in conflict with the ecosystem, rather than an integral part of it.

A large number of groups had questions about how the rules would actually be implemented, such as who would be making the decisions and enforcing the rules, how the proposed rules would relate to existing regulations, guidelines, and processes such as environmental assessments, how the rules would relate to rights, and how conflicts would be resolved. One group recommended that whenever possible, conflicts

should be managed at the lowest possible level, while another emphasized that existing conflict resolution and decision-making processes should not be duplicated. The need for transparency, accountability, adaptability, and good science (which may be lacking) in the implementation of the rules was emphasized.

Although some groups acknowledged that the specific rules proposed in the plan provided a good starting point, revisions and additions were recommended by many of the groups. In particular, a large number of groups suggested that technical terms used in the decision rules, such as carrying capacity, should be clearly defined. It was also suggested that the rules should be made more explicit and detailed, and that reference levels and tolerances should be identified.

A number of groups felt that the priorities in the decision rules needed to be adjusted, but there was a divergence of opinions as to how they should be reprioritized. Some groups argued that human use should be given higher priority, while others felt that protecting biodiversity should be paramount.

Several groups recommended that the decision rules include mechanisms for identifying mitigation measures. Similarly, it was suggested that the rules should recognize best practices and best available technologies and give preference to users who adopt them. One group also recommended that the decision rules include a framework for compensation. A common suggestion made by many groups was that decision rules should be developed for addressing conflicts between competing human uses.

A number of detailed comments were received in relation to specific decision rules. Some of these comments recommended wording revisions while others suggested more substantive changes. For the sake of conciseness, these detailed comments are not recorded in the proceedings, but they have been documented and will be considered.

Overview of the Collaborative Planning Model

Faith Scattolon, A/Associate Regional Director-General, DFO Maritimes Region

The Collaborative Planning Model draws upon earlier discussions and a discussion paper distributed for the 1st ESSIM Forum Workshop in 2002. Earlier drafts of the model were reviewed by the Federal-Provincial ESSIM Working Group in 2004. Input on the model was received at community workshops in three communities in November 2004 and during online discussions held November 2004–January 2005.

The ESSIM Plan is to be developed and implemented by all who are accountable to the plan. Consensus achieved through stakeholder collaboration is the preferred method for groups to make decisions or put forward recommendations. The *Integrated Management Policy and Operational Framework* indicates that the process is not intended to change or interfere with current legislative and regulatory mandates.

The ESSIM Forum is not a decision-making body but is a collective body of all stakeholders for information exchange and feedback, and provides the overall vision and principles for the initiative. The Forum is open to all stakeholders and interested individuals. At present, there are approximately 200 organizations, groups and individuals who receive ESSIM updates. Over 150 people have attended each of the two previous ESSIM Forum Workshops. The ESSIM Online Forum has 130 registered participants. Sectoral participation in the Forum includes: government, coastal communities, fisheries, oil and gas, marine conservation, telecommunications, shipping, and academia. First Nations participation falls within the government sector, as well as other sectors such as fisheries and coastal communities. The ESSIM Forum does not have a formal leadership structure, such as a chair or co-chairs. Leadership will be provided by the Stakeholder Roundtable, with the assistance of the ESSIM Planning Office. The annual Forum meeting is to review and discuss progress over the previous year and to provide input and guidance for the next year's action plan. Annual or semi-annual local/community information and feedback workshops are possible.

The ESSIM Stakeholder Roundtable (SRT) will work with the ESSIM Planning Office to provide leadership and coordination for the initiative. In cooperation with the Planning Office, the SRT will provide shared leadership and coordination for development and implementation of the ESSIM Plan, including ongoing monitoring, evaluation and plan revision as necessary. The SRT will provide input into plan content and feedback on draft work done by the Planning Office. It will ultimately recommend a draft plan for stakeholder acceptance, endorsement by decision-making authorities, and approval under the *Oceans Act*. SRT membership will be balanced by sector and other criteria such as gender, age, geography, group size, capacity, commitment and history. Members will represent or be representative of sectors or the public. Coalitions and selective or rotational participation may be used to keep the group size at a manageable level. Members are to be appointed for 2-year and 3-year staggered terms to ensure continuity. One co-chair will be from DFO and the other will be chosen by the group and rotated on an annual basis. Co-chairs may need additional representation at the table for their respective organizations. Decisions regarding the ESSIM plan and planning process will be made by consensus *when possible*. Consensus means unanimous agreement of the SRT. Stating that a member can "live with" a result will constitute agreement.

The ESSIM Planning Office provides leadership and coordination for development and implementation of the ESSIM Plan, support for the ESSIM Forum and the SRT, and will provide support to the government sector, and others as requested. It is housed within DFO's Oceans and Coastal Management Division (OCMD) for the foreseeable future. A core of DFO resources should be augmented by resources from other federal government departments, and eventually other governments and stakeholders. Secondments and internships should be encouraged. The Planning Office has the responsibility to ensure that all sectors and stakeholders have input into discussions at the appropriate level, and that a range of engagement

mechanisms is available to those who are unable to participate in group processes. A key role is ensuring that all voices are heard.

The Federal-Provincial ESSIM Working Group (est. January 2001) provides an inter-governmental forum to focus on policy, management, operations and regulatory coordination for the ESSIM area. It builds government support and cohesion for the ESSIM Initiative and includes representatives of over 20 ocean-related federal and provincial departments, agencies and boards. Leadership and support are provided by OCMD and it meets approximately 4 times per year. The group makes decisions by consensus; however, decisions are non-binding on departments, agencies or boards.

The Regional Committee on Ocean Management (RCOM) is proposed as the senior executive forum for federal and provincial departments and agencies with oceans-related program activities. RCOM will provide: coordinated decision making at the intergovernmental and interdepartmental levels on planning, management and regulatory matters for integrated management and planning processes within the Maritimes Region; internal oversight, monitoring and performance assessment of integrated management and planning processes; and, formal and executive-level government involvement in the development and implementation of plans in integrated management and planning processes. RCOM will be a body of decision-makers, each with mandated decision-making powers at the zonal/regional level. RCOM will provide advice and recommendations to mandated decision-making processes to be implemented via the relevant government departments, agencies and boards.

DFO is inviting comments on the proposed model. Is this an effective, transparent, and inclusive process? How can sectors be effectively represented on the Stakeholder Roundtable? How can stakeholder participation be encouraged and maintained?

In November 2004, DFO held community workshops to solicit input on the ESSIM Initiative. The draft plan is now out for public review, further development, and revision. The public consultation process will continue until September 2005. The SRT is to be formed by June 2005 and the draft plan is to undergo internal sectoral dialogue and review among various sectors over the summer. Sector agreement and endorsement by decision makers is expected this fall. Plan approval under the *Oceans Act* is optimistically targeted for February 2006. Plan implementation is to occur via the development of action plans for priority actions outlined in the plan. Monitoring, evaluation, and adapting the plan will occur as the implementation process moves forward. The ESSIM Online Forum will continue to hold discussions on the draft ESSIM Plan until mid-March 2004. Opportunities for public input will continue through the spring and summer of 2005.

It is recommended that the membership for the SRT be determined through internal sector caucuses and discussion. Each sector is asked to meet as a caucus and discuss their representation on the Stakeholder Roundtable. Sector caucuses may be assisted by neutral facilitators provided by the Planning Office. Sector caucuses will be asked to consider and use the proposed selection criteria guidelines when choosing their representatives, and be prepared to provide a rationale for their decisions. The Planning Office may also be asked to provide support to other sector processes or coalition-building activities. OCMD will continue to hold bilateral meetings to build support for the plan and the proposed Collaborative Planning Model. Working groups may be formed if necessary to work through issues.

Q&A Session on the Collaborative Planning Model

Bob Rangeley (World Wildlife Fund): I'm interested in the regional committee process. I understand that will be where decisions are made. Will that be a transparent process and how will decisions be resolved among those decision makers?

Joe Arbour (DFO): If you're referring to this thing that we've called RCOM – the Regional Committee on Ocean Management, that is primarily focussed on coordinating the efforts of government in terms of the ESSIM process. So we have to recognize that there needs to be a window from the whole ESSIM process into government where what comes out, i.e., the recommendations and the advice from the Roundtable can feed into the government process which represents the regulatory and the policy side. So that mechanism is intended to be embedded in government. It functions in as open and transparent a way as a government committee will function, but it's not intended to represent in a sense the ultimate decision making. The Roundtable is where the heart of the ESSIM process sits, because that's where the sectors and stakeholders and representatives sit at the table, and where they work through the process of looking at the issues and looking at what needs to be recommended. I like to look at this Regional Committee on Ocean Management as representing the window into some of the government-based decision-making processes, but that's not the entire universe of decision making. The private sector and the corporate sector have windows into decision making and hopefully what comes out of the Roundtable can influence not only what is being decided on the government side, but also in the corporate side and in individuals who use this ocean area and that that advice and recommendations can go out and influence them. So, I don't know if that is specific to your question, Bob, but I'm just trying to capture what we see as the dynamics of what that is.

Bob Rangeley (World Wildlife Fund): I don't think you quite answered it though. What I'm asking is, recommendations coming up from the Roundtable, when there's a request for a decision and we have a decision-making body representing a number of different mandates, what is the process then for those decisions, the deliberations or the process for decision making there? How will we know if recommendations are actually being acted upon at that decision-making level?

Joe Arbour (DFO): Again, at the Roundtable, those who represent that particular sector, be it government or whoever, when advice is fed to a particular sector, those representatives will have to come back to the Roundtable after consulting with their sector and present what is going to be the action that is taken within that particular sector to act on the agreed upon action plan. That's where we describe the Roundtable as being the very heart of the mechanism where 1) the advice and recommendations are generated, and 2) the accountability of coming back and reporting on what you are going to do in response to that. And that applies to all sectors that are represented around the table.

Bruce Chapman (Groundfish Enterprise Allocation Council): I have two questions of Faith or yourself. They both relate to the Stakeholder Roundtable. One of them, and Faith used the words that at this Roundtable there will be decisions or recommendations more likely, because it's not a decision-making body. Where possible, it will be done by unanimous consensus, so where not possible, what happens? If it's not unanimity, virtual unanimity, what happens? And the second one, on this proposed governance structure of the whole process. While we're being asked for feedback, it's very well developed. It's far-developed and it seems to be very much developed for tapping the general public I guess. It makes the statement that it is not meant to replace or displace existing consultative processes and mechanisms, but it kind of has that effect for some in the view of the fishing industry at least. So what we do, for example, we have a Scotia-Fundy Roundtable and that has been proposed to us as something that anything that affects the fishing industry generally, not just for a specific fleet sector or a specific area, which will be the body that we would primarily debate and discuss the issue and provide input to government. So if that's our primary body to provide input to government, it seems to me that on the plan issues we now have this Stakeholder Roundtable as a primary mechanism to provide input to government. Having two or three people from the fishing industry on this mechanism doesn't do it from the perspective of those of us who have discussed this so far. So how can we reconcile that? I mean we want to maintain our Scotia-Fundy Roundtable as the main mechanism for this, and how do we do that and also deal with this one?

Faith Scattolon (DFO): I'll answer the second part first. I would start by saying first of all let's go back to the discussion yesterday morning about what the ESSIM plan is. It is a strategic-level plan, it's not going to get down to the nitty-gritty of the detailed operational plans that exist for various sectors, whether it be oil and gas or fishing or shipping, whatever the case may be. It is a strategic-level plan that will set strategic-level objectives and then making those operational will rest with the respective industries. So to use your example of the fishing industry, in fact I would say you folks are probably well-positioned to move into this process. You have your Fisheries Roundtable which does get into fairly detailed issues, or discussion of issues. It gives you a mechanism to develop your positions and views on specific issues and then bring those to the Stakeholder Roundtable for that interaction with other stakeholders, with other interests. So I think you are fairly well positioned to participate in this process. The numbers? – I am not going to get up here a try to argue numbers with 150 other people in the room. We will have to have some discussion obviously over the next few months as we try to put the Stakeholder Roundtable together because you could have all kinds of permutations and combinations on numbers. On the first question about decisions and recommendations, I think the point that you were getting at was when I said the Roundtable will operate by consensus where possible. I guess most groups, collectives of people, that is how they operate, by consensus where possible. Where there's not consensus on an issue, what's done with that, I don't pretend to be able to answer that today to this group. You may decide where there's not consensus on an issue, to park it. You may decide where there's not consensus on an issue, to give it to a smaller group to come back with some set of recommendations to deal with the issues. But it's not much different than how any collective of individuals working towards some objectives operates.

Bruce Chapman (Groundfish Enterprise Allocation Council): If I can just respond a bit, and I'll deal with your second one first. I think the issue of having everybody agree at the table would eliminate the problems that some of us have on the relative representation in such a group. Otherwise you will have suggestions from us that users should have a dominant participation at the mechanism, but again if it is not a voting structure, if there's buy-in by all parties then it's done, it becomes less of a problem and concern for everybody. The other part of it though is, you seem to suggest that because this is a strategic-level forum or mechanism at this SRT, and some of us have our sector forums, that all of that should play out. It implies that at the sector level we don't also think strategically or want to think strategically. And I know that's not what you meant, but what's in the plan is a statement of developing objectives, developing decision rules, or developing a lot of these things. We could sit at a table and have long discussions and differences of view on what an objective should actually be stated as, and the wording – we did some of that yesterday at different tables, and that's important because from these words flow planning and actions. And so this strategic-level stuff can impact very directly on all of us. We would want to engage in that at our consultative mechanism with DFO, and not just have the opportunity to input on that through the SRT. And where the two of them mix, I don't know if either will have duplication, which we don't need and can't afford the time.

Faith Scattolon (DFO): No, I agree. Maybe the way to wrap our minds around this is to work through some examples. Derek is going to talk about deep-sea corals this afternoon. I'm going out on a limb here and say that if we did a show of hands and said, as a broad objective do people in this room feel that it is important to protect deep-sea corals, I'd guess that everybody would raise there hands. Then, at what level, that's something I think that the Stakeholder Roundtable would need to discuss, and then how do you do that, is something that I would see the various industry people going away and saying how do we contribute to this, what can we offer to achieve this objective?

Bruce Chapman (Groundfish Enterprise Allocation Council): Great example – the question of at what level? We have little interest in just sort of handing that discussion and input over to the SRT. We very much want to feel that our views and our input on that can be held at our Roundtable in the fishing sector,

particularly, because it's a great example, because we're the ones that are most directly impacted by the coral conservation strategy. So at what level affects us probably more than any other single group and we want to have our direct input on the question of at what level. We don't want to have the SRT to deal with that. Or if they are going to deal with that, that's fine, but to what extent do the "what level" of SRT's views and the "what level" of the fishing sector's views get reconciled if they are different views?

Faith Scattolon (DFO): We've got to live it for a bit to figure some of these questions out I think. Thanks Bruce.

Plenary Panel on the Collaborative Planning Model

Mike Butler (Moderator), Director, Atlantic Coastal Zone Information Steering Committee (ACZISC), and Associate Director, Oceans Management Research Network (OMRN), Halifax.

Thank you, Joe. One or two quick things before I introduce the panel. The Oceans and Coastal Management Division are all very, very nice people. In fact, watch they don't kill you by kindness. I suspect that Carol Ann introduced corporal punishment about a year ago and that anyone who didn't smile would get it, so beware of that one. And a compliment, and I wasn't paid to say this, but I think the documentation associated with this process is superb. I've been involved in many projects and this one I think, if you've read them all, and I'm assuming you've read all the documents produced, you will be very well informed. Whether there's the Stakeholder Roundtable that Faith has obviously been talking about, the ESSIM Planning Group, the Federal-Provincial ESSIM Working Group, the RCOM, the Online Forum, ESSIM Sub-regional Planning Working Group, the ESSIM Science Working Group, the Ecosystem Objectives Working Group, ESSIM Human Use Objectives Working Group, and so on, and you even got a questionnaire in the back of your documentation asking you for further comments, so anybody who says they haven't been engaged, I don't believe you.

One quick, interesting observation: the ACZISC does have a mandate for integrated coastal management in Atlantic Canada, but we have no authority whatsoever. Whereas ESSIM has a mandate, but as you will have heard they have some authority there, so if there is not a consensus, beware.

Captain Ivan Lantz, Director of Marine Operations, Shipping Federation of Canada, Montreal.

Good morning and it's a pleasure to be here and thank you very much for that kind introduction, and no I'm not going to wow you with any facts and figures, I don't think that's appropriate. We do carry a couple of hundred million tonnes of cargo around the East Coast of Canada, but that's the nature of the game, and shipping has been part of the scene and we're happy to be a part of this scene and part of this solution and expect to be here for a long time along with the rest of our colleagues. Good presentation on the Collaborative Planning Model and I think it covers a lot of good territory. We have to keep in mind that ESSIM is the first of and probably a small version of what will probably grow into something that is larger or has to metamorphose over time. There will need to be other planning models, but there should not have to be brand new processes, brand new inventions of management models to go along with it. And this will need federal government buy-in because it is ultimately the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans who is responsible for the *Oceans Act* and who is going to make the decisions in the final analysis on exactly what the plan is / is not, approvals are / are not, etc. So I think that keeping it evolving, keeping it elastic is vitally important. The Stakeholder Roundtable is a good example of that; it has already been planned in that it will change and it will evolve, and yes it has to evolve because it will grow into a full East Coast group or something of that nature, not this year, but in sometime to come. And I beg all of you to keep that in mind in the larger scope of things.

I have been working with a group on the International Joint Commission that has been working on the regulations, new plans, new decision factors, and new criteria for the regulation of the level of Lake Ontario. One of the key features of that program has been what we call a PIAG – a Public Interest Advisory Group. The PIAG is a group of volunteers that gather in the plan structure, information and so on. And assimilate that into presentations which they take out to the community and then in the communities they get the feedback from the local population, interest groups, whoever is there – small groups usually, 10 to 20 people, whatever. A huge group appeared one time of 200 people and they almost didn't know what to do with it. They were standing up around the walls at a local church community hall. This is I believe an extremely important feed-in feature that is part of the broadcast listening, consult, and even your working group research feed-in that has to come back into the Stakeholder Roundtable that has to feed into the decision-making process that has to be underpinned by the Planning Office. There is no question about it the Planning Office is the foundation of all. It does not make the decisions; the decisions are still made by the Minister's office somewhere. The Minister may at sometime decide to have a board of directors-type of organization that will in a larger or more national governance objective be required. At this particular stage of the game it is probably sufficient to have the Stakeholder Roundtable, but at some future time you should build in the feature that there might need to be a smaller body of that which will be able to help with the decision or focus in on the decision-making process.

There is a lot in the Planning Model that suggests there should be Federal-Provincial organization, that seems to have some sort of a priority over government departmental organization, multi-levels on the government side, and that seems to get some priority over other stakeholder inputs and interests in management. I am not sure I agree with that. I believe that me, as an association representative, it is my responsibility to come here as a representative of my trade. And my responsibility going out from here is to take back the ROI (return on investment), what I've got from my invested time being here and feed that back to my industry and then my industry is going to feed back to me their feedback and comments. And I believe that as an association, and largely these groups are made up of associations, the Stakeholder group will be made up of largely associations, government departments etc., you have to take responsibility, you have to be empowered to be a part of that stakeholder group. And therefore the federal government, provincial-federal government empowerment side of that, that's just part of the stakeholder group. The decisions come down to only one body, and that's at the Federal level in the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. Sadly the federal government does not seem to be represented here and I think that's a very serious oversight on their part, and they damn well should be here. I don't mind sending out that criticism.

Another feature that has come up is the Lake Ontario regulation study. They have developed a model which cuts across all of the users' interests, and a board decision room to go along with it. It's a computerized model, so it helps in all of the decision-making factors by weighing in the interests of fisheries, environment, riparian, coastal, wetlands interests, water level users, transport users, hydro users, municipal water intakes, emergency responders, the whole lot. The shared vision model they call it and I would think that through the research groups, the modeling to create an oceans plan you need tools to work with and I would highly recommend that the Planning Office investigate that shared vision model. You may find that it's the basis for which you can adopt something to have tools that you are really going to need to work with to make intelligent decisions, informed decisions. Thank you very much.

Bruce Cameron, Director of Policy and Analysis, Nova Scotia Department of Energy, Halifax.

Thank you very much. I would like to say on behalf of the Nova Scotia Department of Energy and the Province of Nova Scotia that the Province is here, and is very much engaged in not just the shore but in the ocean itself, particularly when it comes to energy matters where there is an agreement for joint management rather than just federal government. And I think that many people in the room understand

that, but I think it illustrates the complexity of the task here because we are dealing with multi-jurisdictional issues as well as multi-stakeholder issues. And that provides a challenge for us but it's one that we have successfully managed in a number of areas, and I think it's important to think that we can do it here.

What I just want to do with my few minutes here is to reflect on a couple of processes that I've been through in the last couple of years, that of collaborative, multi-stakeholder processes that have some relevance for the kinds of issues and things that we are talking about here at ESSIM. One of them was the Cape Breton Review, the multi-stakeholder committee that followed the Cape Breton Review, the Ad Hoc Committee. We met for about 6 months trying to bring people together to come to a consensus on what should be happening in oil and gas offshore Cape Breton. The very positive thing that came out of it is that everybody came to a much greater sense of awareness and understanding of why people were coming to the views that they came to, and a greater knowledge, a greater appreciation for everybody, a greater respect. It was very positive experience in that respect. But we did not come to consensus. And in fact at the end of the day we recognized that the reason why we could not come to consensus was because we had these different perspectives that we were bringing to the table. And a lot of it had to do with perceptions of risk and reward. And that was, in the end, an irreconcilable difference but the process was still a very positive one, there were good relationships built in a number of areas because of that.

And a similar experience came through when I spent the last couple of years on an advisory committee to the Minister of Environment, federally. It was an oil and gas issue sub-committee and we were dealing with some ocean environmental assessment issues. This was once again a broad multi-stakeholder process. We spent 2 years and 15 meetings and at the end of the day we came tantalizingly close to agreeing on objectives but failed to reach unanimous views on every single one of them. But when it came down to the guts of the details of it, there was no consensus. In fact, out of that particular process, there is a lesson that I think we need to take into account for this one, which was that even the progress (actually it's valid in both processes) the people who came and spent the time working together to understand everyone's point of view became more informed, more engaged at the table, but when they left the table to go back to their own stakeholders, the position shifted again. And I think that is just a natural kind of function that people who get very well informed begin to shift their opinions, but we need to figure out how we can bring everyone else who hasn't been involved in the process along as well. And that's one of the difficulties.

I think it's important to recognize that it is possible to reach consensus on higher level things. It's when you get down to the nitty-gritty details that people start departing from consensus. And I just want to leave with the following observation, is that at the end of the day governments want to have consensus. Politicians, my boss, would just love to have consensus out of here. It just makes their life a whole lot easier. When it doesn't happen though, life goes on and some of the things that we'll be talking about over the next number of years as part of ESSIM, somebody is going to have to make a decision one way or the other, sometimes doing nothing is a decision, sometimes it's actually taking action, and ultimately it will be the governments who have to do that whether it be federal, provincial or municipal. They all have some impact and they have a broader accountability. They have accountability not just to the 150 people in this room, but in the case of Nova Scotia, nearly one million people, and some 600,000 of them are voters. So there is that kind of ultimate accountability which will take place here, but I want to assure you that the political process would salute all of us if we're able to come to the greatest degree of consensus we possibly can. Because that will be taken notice of and acted on to the degree that consensus is possible.

Larry Hildebrand, Manager, Sustainable Communities and Ecosystems Division, Community Programs, Environment Canada, Dartmouth.

Thanks Mike and thanks DFO for the opportunity to be on this panel. I've been a very long-time supporter of ESSIM and the process that we're pursuing here, and I guess I'm coming from a sense of wanting to make it work. I have expressed my opinion in the past, I've talked a lot about capacity and I heard that come up a number of times as recently as this morning – about our capacity to participate in this process, the capacity to go through the work that's going to be required to reach consensus, to have these plans, and to conduct our affairs in a different way. But I guess I'm shifting my attention now to commitment – commitment to this process over the long-term. I think the collaborative planning model before us is a good one, it makes sense, there are other models, but I think I'm getting a sense that this is a reasonable way to go, perhaps with some tweaking. Yet, I think we're all being rather Canadian in this process. We're showing up obediently at forums and working group meetings, participating in working groups, nodding in the right direction, smiling appropriately, believing in the process. And that's great. I'm concerned though about a year to 5 years from now when the heavy lifting starts. This is the easy part, believe it or not. Oh, sure let's believe in a model and we'll reach consensus and we'll have lovely objectives and so on. It's going to be very hard when we get down to the real issues – you know, what do we do with coral? How do we balance these various uses and so on? That's one challenge that I think we're all aware of that we're going to have to be grappling with. But the real concern is, are we all going to be around this table, these various tables in 2, 3, 4, 5 years time? I'm concerned that we'll develop a very good process, a very good plan, but I'm concerned about implementation.

I can tell you from Environment Canada (federal government here), we're aware of, certainly been aware of participating enthusiastically in this process and the many other ones that are going to take place across the country. And I have been, as others have, advocating very strongly the need, the relevance of this process and this ecosystem to Environment Canada, and our need to participate. But I can tell you it's nowhere in our plans. We have sort of no people officially allocated to it. It doesn't appear in our strategic objectives, we are not talking about how we are really going to participate in this next year, the years that follow. So I'm concerned for ourselves, and I think perhaps everyone else about having a great process in place, and then the energy falling off or worse, sort of crashing and burning when it comes time to spend the energy and do the hard work that's going to be required.

So I'm reflecting and our department is reflecting and perhaps each of you in your own hearts and souls and workplans (don't necessarily put those together), really be honest about your ability, your organization's ability in a few years time to be involved in what I call that heavy lifting. Because this is the easy part, the hard work comes in the subsequent years. So, this comes down to, I think, what I get asked and what I hope we all ask of ourselves, what are the benefits of this process? People, you know, the pragmatic people that we work with, say is the benefit going to be greater than the cost of our investment in this process? – sending people, being on these committees, changing potentially the way that we do things. And I've challenged and I think it's a collective challenge here to be identifying in very practical terms, okay, the eastern Scotian Shelf or the entire Scotian Shelf, what is it going to look like in the near and long-term future? Is it going to be worth the investment? Those are the practical questions that we get asked. Is the fishing sector going to prosper? Will we have corals better protected? Will the shipping industry be able to operate, or oil and gas in a more streamlined fashion? Are the clams going to be happy? Those are the things that we have to ask, and I think are going to be essential to understand to go back to that question of commitment. Again, we can agree with the process, but in very practical terms we have to know at the end of the day is it going to be worth it. Thank you.

Jean-Guy d'Entremont, Inshore Fisheries Ltd., West Pubnico, Nova Scotia.

I would like to thank the organizers for inviting me here. I did prepare a 3-slide presentation in case I couldn't get through it in time, so that you have an idea of what I want to say. It's not clear but this is a picture of a wind park and this is in my backyard, there's 17 large windmills making green energy. And I

just want to say that some of these wind parks are being placed in various ocean areas and it's not only on land. So we are accepting change in Pubnico, that's in my backyard.

The Plan should include input from all sectors and it has to remain strategic, and like Faith said this morning, the Plan must state what should be done and let us decide how to do it with our government agencies. Also we need room for common sense; we have to leave room in the Plan for common sense. Sometimes it's very important. The fisheries sector has poor representation here for a $1.2 billion industry, an export industry, and I'm a little concerned about that. I'm here representing my company, Inshore Fisheries, and my sons who plan to go into business with me in the future, and I'm not really here representing the sector. That's an issue I have here. So we have been utilizing the ESSIM area for about 60 years now and I would like to continue. That's the point. Also the draft plan I don't feel is very friendly to the fishing industry and if you look at the language, I find it bureaucratic, and also there appears to be little input from industry here, from the fishing industry. I'm worried that the proposed plan already has a timeline, so you have a target and you are trying to meet that deadline to approve the plan and be the first one there in Canada, and I understand that because I'm in the business, I like to be first, I like to be ahead, but if we act too quickly, too fast, I think we can muff it up.

I think that the best fisheries group to deal with this is not myself, it's through the Roundtable and I think that's where the heavy lifting in the fisheries has to come from there. In June 2003, the 3rd North Atlantic Responsible Fishing Conference took place in Yarmouth, it was an international conference, and the closing statements of that conference I think will sum it up. These are the closing statements: directly the fishing industry has the most to gain, the most to lose from the fishery resource. The ocean is not an endless pit; we understand that, we accept that. We have adopted the Canadian Code of Conduct for Responsible Fishing Operations. We collaborate with DFO on joint surveys etc., we have to work jointly toward sustainable solutions. We need to help fund part of the research and development. We have to co-manage for sustainability. We need to promote compliance, attract capable recruits in our industry, and finally the need for the fishing industry to cooperate to optimize ocean use. So you see, the will is there to act in good faith, and it's important that this plan isn't set up to exclude people, it's important for sectors. I think that if the plan is well developed and well designed with adequate input that it will foster shared stewardship and that's what is needed here. Thank you.

Mark Butler, Marine Issues Coordinator and Internal Director, Ecology Action Centre, Halifax.

Thank you Mike, thank you Jean-Guy and thank you everybody for this opportunity. In preparing for this actually I did talk to my colleagues in the conservation movement to try and get their views. I probably haven't captured it adequately, and I probably did it too little, too late and that will probably be a problem for all sectors as we go along in this process. I think one feeling is, let's do it and it's not let government do it, but let's all of us do it, let's get on with it. We think that the process, the structure that we've got right now is basically sound. But the only way to really know, and I see evolution or adaptation is one of the principles, is to give it a try. So let's put the boat in the water and see if it floats. But there's a but, I guess. Process is only as good as the results, and if in 5 years there's no results, then there's something wrong with the process. So, show us the results. And I want to raise something that probably comes at this issue differently, the other direction than say Bruce Chapman was raising or even Jean-Guy, when it comes to results, there are other processes out there that are making decisions regarding the Scotian Shelf and the diversity on the Scotian Shelf, and about coastal communities and independent fishermen, in the fisheries, in oil and gas. I have been involved in some of them. These principles like inclusion, consensus, and accountability often are not there at all. For example, and this is perhaps something for you guys to note, that the Atlantic Large Pelagics Advisory Committee is meeting today. In the future probably, if ESSIM is going to have some prominence there shouldn't be other meetings happening at the same time. But there's also something called the Scotia-Fundy Large Pelagics Advisory Committee, and essentially we've been told we can't even sit at the table, that we have to sit at the back of the room. And

they are making important decisions regarding conservation at those meetings, so I think relative to other processes this is a relatively fair, inclusive, and accountable process. Same goes for oil and gas – the recent best practices for seismic that have just come out. Basically 60 days for public consultation, but independent scientists, conservation groups not involved at all in coming up with those, whereas I believe government and industry were very much involved.

In terms of making some recommendations which strengthens this process, so it means something, so we get results, one question as I look around the room, and I don't know if this is what Larry was referring to, should there be more senior people from government departments at the Forum itself? I don't know, maybe we don't need them. Maybe the people who know are here and that's enough, but I guess it is one measure perhaps. And I don't know if this is what Ivan mentioned when he said the federal government, and somebody else has brought this up too, politicians, should there be a role for politicians, either the Minister or the Liberals or other parties, to participate in this process somehow so it has more relevance and meaning? And how are we going to engage the media and thereby the public? And I have one recommendation, nothing to do with process perhaps, but if you're going to use a word like ESSIM you're never going to capture the public's imagination. If you call it something like the "Corals and Canyons Initiative", and that's totally out to lunch, but something like that, then that begins to mean something to people. First Nations, that's already been mentioned and I know you don't do it like that, but the government is aware of that. And I think that we also need to get, you've tried with your community meetings to get outside of Halifax, but maybe the next Forum should be in a place like Port Hawkesbury, outside of Halifax. We need people in coastal communities in Sheet Harbour etc., to feel apart of this. Then we need to get outside of Halifax, we need to bring them in. Just one comment on boundaries, I think that we shouldn't expand the boundaries of ESSIM, partly because it brings in a whole new group of people which would affect the process, until we know the boundaries for the other integrated management areas. And finally, I had a conversation with somebody yesterday where we said, well in the end it really comes down to attitude. You say, oh God, am I going to count on attitude? Is that enough for me to participate, to devote some resources to this process? But maybe that's what we need to count on right now, and good will. And Larry mentioned commitment and I think it means commitment on all our parts. We can make this work and I need to go back to my own organization and talk to my members about ESSIM, which to some extent I probably haven't done, or put it on our website. I don't think that ESSIM is on our website, maybe it should be there. Thank you.

Cheryle Hislop, Ph.D. candidate, University of Tasmania, and Fulbright Fellow, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Massachusetts.

Thank you. I'm here to provide an outsider's view and from Tasmania I couldn't get anymore outside. So thank you very much for the invitation to participate and I hope that I can contribute in a small but meaningful way. We have similar experiences in marine resource management in Tasmania and that's an area I am very familiar with. So I have a certain amount of empathy towards what's being developed here. I see the collaborative planning model and the Stakeholder Roundtable as incremental steps towards the deliberative, democratic process, and a great way of government-citizen interaction. Also the term roundtable, which is something we don't use at least in Tasmania, gives a sort of specific specificity and it imparts a sense of community, it sort of legitimizes involvement and it also imparts a sense of place in the process which is a great start towards collaborative management and collaborative planning.

The rest of it I'm afraid is going to have to be a semantic analysis because I'm not involved directly; I read only what's available on the public Forum. Something I wanted to refer to was on page 3 of the Collaborative Planning Model discussion paper; it defines collaborative management which is part of the collaborative process. In the next paragraph, however, it states that the *Policy and Operational Framework for Integrated Management* clearly indicates that the process is not intended to alter or interfere with current legislative and regulatory mandates. This implies to me that there's a little bit of

rigidity or inflexibility between management and regulations, even mandates need to be flexible and changeable. It also causes one to ponder the meaning or intent of adaptive management when the mandates remain fixed. And therefore I wonder how inclusive the process of collaboration really is and also, last but not least in that particular perspective, is learning by doing, which needs to include modifications to mandates as well as regulatory instruments, I feel. So that if the mandate isn't helping achieve the desired outcome, then there can be that re-evaluation and modification.

Now this other area that I'm about to embark on has been raised quite a lot this morning, and that's consensus. Now the pragmatist in me or perhaps the cynic, questions the achievability of a win-win situation in these situations. Unless decision makers are prepared to accept a lowest common denominator decision to achieve consensus, lowest common denominator decisions rarely have the desired affect in either the maintenance of ecosystem health or the socio-economic considerations. In resource use and extraction and management decisions concerning human resource interaction there are always those that perceive themselves as, or are, losers. So I noticed that there was majority rules course mentioned in routine administrative decisions being arrived at through consensus (this is on page 11), if consensus can't be reached, then a majority vote. Although I'm a bit confused here, does this apply only to routine administrative decisions, because I'm assuming that not all management decisions are classified as routine administrative?

And the last area that I was looking at and this is also very prominent in the Tasmanian context is the proposed membership for the ESSIM Stakeholder Roundtable. For this small amount of people to represent such a massive part of their industry, seems to imply an enormous workload for the reps who need to gather information and funnel a whole lot of different fisheries views into a position of the fishery industry. And this quite possibly could mean a stakeholder burnout, that stakeholder burnout is a constant challenge. And last but not least, I don't know whether this has been done but I think it would be a really interesting exercise, so forgive me if it has already been attempted in the ESSIM process, people talk about values and legitimacy in stakeholder involvement. An interesting exercise would be to form an anonymous questionnaire, sent from the federal level down to forums like this, of how people rank stakeholders or consider their role in environmental management or in ecological interactions. So it could be a questionnaire that is specifically designed with explanations for the ranking spectrum, so that people can specify who they believe are the most primary or definitive stakeholders in the system, and sort of rank them – just an interesting exercise to see how peoples' values and legitimacy fit into this process. And then back to the office, and I know that no person in an agency wants more work, but it would be an interesting exercise and probably quite rewarding. So thank you very much.

Open Microphone Session for the Plenary Panel

Bob Rangeley (World Wildlife Fund): I had a question for Larry or maybe it's more of a comment. I actually share his concern about staying the course and the fact that in his government department there isn't actually a strategy that's linked, or plans that are linked, to this process. So, my question is how do we get this at the level where it's in the workplans of government? Maybe that's linked to a question of why is this plan being signed off only by the Fisheries Minister? Perhaps all the other relevant Ministers should take responsibility. Should this be more closely linked to the *Oceans Action Plan* where decisions are made at cabinet level?

Larry Hildebrand (DFO): In terms of departmental buy-in, that's coming at the highest level through the Interdepartmental Committee on Oceans, this is the deputy and assistant deputy minister level. So the whole approach to ocean management in Canada is being discussed there. And of course this plan and the others that are coming along will be there. That's early in the process. I think the polite nodding is going on, we're showing up, but I think it's down at this level, our regional office, my office, some other related

branches and so on, it's still not completely there. I think it's improving, but again I think it's going to come back to, bluntly, what's in it for us? I think the idea, perhaps the expectation that we all embrace this and can see the benefits and articulate them and so on, what I'm hearing is more that such crasser assessment. You know, is it worth my investment? Are my interests going to be protected? Love to cooperate with everyone as long as nothing bad happens to me, or I have to change what I do too dreadfully. I think as we go further in describing those benefits, that's going to help and there are a lot of dedicated people within the organizations that are trying to get that buy-in, so a long way to go but it's coming.

Bob Rangeley (World Wildlife Fund): To Jean-Guy, his comment about he's here, he's interested in the value of the fishery for his business and for his sons. One thing I don't see in this plan and I'd like to direct towards Jean-Guy is how do we see the future value of the fishery? Where do you want it to be for your sons and grandsons in the future in terms of the wealth that you take from the resources? And I think we should link those kinds of goals to overall ecosystem health. So is that something that this kind of process is worth your time investing in? And are those achievable goals that we can measure and actually aim for, have some real tangible goals for the future in terms of fisheries resources?

Jean-Guy d'Entremont (Inshore Fisheries Ltd.): I guess my goal would be to continue and have sustainable fisheries, sustainable use. The goal would be where you do know what's wrong, you try to eliminate that, and where you know you're doing what's right, you try to do more of that, and you try to improve the situation along the way. In my opinion, we have to improve the capacity of the oceans for the resource; I'm taking about just fisheries resource here. That's how I see it.

Bob Rangeley (World Wildlife Fund): So you see that as a recovery goal, in other words, bring it back to some better state. Is that what you're getting at?

Jean-Guy d'Entremont (Inshore Fisheries Ltd.): Yes, like Georges Bank haddock is probably fully recovered now. It's time to exploit it. Other fisheries still need recovering, so you have various, it's not simple. You have to keep doing your job better as you learn. You have to be able to do that.

Bob Rangeley (World Wildlife Fund): But is this the process that can do it for you?

Jean-Guy d'Entremont (Inshore Fisheries Ltd.): That's a fisheries matter in my opinion and DFO is striving to do that and that's where it should be done and it should be inputted in this plan. There should be a link; I'm not sure where to have that link. But I have a question for you. The comment to Larry here on how to get to where the rubber meets the road and how do you get government to buy-in and what have you. I'm thinking about in another capacity I chair an advisory committee to the Minister, and we have consultations, we go around and we get information and input from industry, we get the input from the government and we provide the Minister with advice. Some people choose to circumvent that system, not participate, just go lobby the Ministers or whatever politically and try to get in through that door. How do you see this process? Do you still see lots of political intervention in this process, or how do you see this?

Bob Rangeley (World Wildlife Fund): The lobbying goes both ways, we certainly know there's fisheries advisory committees and there's a considerable amount of lobbying going on the side, as well as other political activity by other groups, no question. I don't know the answer to that. I think certainly this kind of a process, I'm hopeful that it can sort of clear away some of those other distractions. But the clear thing here is to set some achievable targets so that we know what direction we are heading in. We kind of need a rudder and a destination and that hasn't been really specified, and those are things we can measure so that we don't end up down at the lowest common denominator as was pointed out.

Jean-Guy d'Entremont (Inshore Fisheries Ltd.): I just see what Larry said earlier about keeping the ball rolling and everything, it's so much work to follow this process that some people will elect to go the route of lobbying the politicians. So I think that if it's too strenuous, too difficult, too time-consuming, you are going to see that. I don't see how you get around it.

John Coon (University of New Hampshire): It is with great trepidation that I open my mouth, but like Cheryle I'm an outside observer and have been trying desperately to research collaborative planning processes in terms of environmental planning. And as many of you are probably aware in the United States the Oceans Commission has laid out some recommendations that include not only ocean planning but going as far as the watershed. The great difficulty that I have trying to get people to attend meetings like this or even preliminary sessions is that many people are very happy with the status quo. For instance, Captain Lantz, what is in it for the members of the panel for there to be a plan at all? I mean under the status quo there is still shipping allowed, there are still groups that apparently are capably handling fishing matters at least as we're aware of to date trying to rebuild stocks and others and exploit those that have been rebuilt. And I'd like just to address the panel, when we talk about burnout, when we talk about keeping this up for a couple of years, do you think it can be done and is it better to have plan for all of you than to perhaps not have a plan?

Jean-Guy d'Entremont (Inshore Fisheries Ltd.): In my opinion, the status quo is not good enough. I think that we're fishing one day and then suddenly a ship goes by and puts a cable and we never knew anything about it, a submarine cable. We need to get everybody in the room, somewhere along the line we need to get everybody in the room and have some of these discussions before it takes place. So I think we need something. I think we are going in the right direction from a fisheries representative.

Bruce Cameron (NS Energy): I'll make an observation of how to engage people. One of the challenges that I think we're going to look at is how to engage people over the longer period of time. I think that we need to recognize who is in the room today is probably a handful of people who are actually involved in earning their living from the ocean here, whether it be fishing, oil and gas, recreation, transportation, it's still only a handful of people who are in the room. But my experience has been that people will only come to the table and become engaged when they clearly see their interests being challenged or advanced. So at a certain point when we're talking about developing the plan with whoever chooses to be engaged, we are going to have to build into a process as things begin to emerge in a very concrete way, that's the point where we will start engaging people. And in our own planning process we recognize the fact that we will have a full stop, a pause, when we have something concrete that people can say, yes I like that or I don't like that. We're going to build that in. We can't assume we're going to be developing the plan and then a last minute at-the-end process, OK it's been blessed by all of us, are you still OK with it? In fact it's going to have to be probably a very active re-engagement when people see things that are very, very concrete and see their interests affected or advanced. Once we keep that in mind when we're doing it, it will be a good thing.

Captain Ivan Lantz (Shipping Federation of Canada): I view the question as a challenge like, if we don't plan and if we don't get ourselves a passage plan or an ocean plan or a geographical plan, a use plan, and if we don't get engaged and build it for ourselves, a plan designed by us for us for what we can do, then our alternative is probably to get one imposed upon us, and it might not be what we like. So my challenge is, get involved.

Kees Zwanenburg (DFO Science): I would like to respond to the question that I've heard a number of times around the room, and that is, what's in it for me? I'd like to relate that to what Larry said, we are so Canadian. We're nice, we smile, we go on with things, we get along, we agree. And I think that what's in it for us is that I look at the history of the Scotian Shelf and the rest of the world and I see how people reconstruct what these systems that we use and that we live in and that we take wealth from looked like a

hundred, two hundred, and three hundred years ago, and what they had in them. They are significantly different. Now they are degraded, they are abused. They are used as garbage dumps. There is a sense of entitlement in our society which is beyond belief in some cases. There is a sense of disconnection. For most people in Canada I would say they have no idea where most of their food comes from, particularly seafood. They have no idea what the costs are, ecologically or otherwise to produce. So I think I agree with Mark Butler, I think we need an attitudinal change. I think we need to become slightly more passionate about this process. I think we need to become engaged, I think we need to speak up and speak out and not be so bloody nice all the time. And to say to people who make their living from the fishing industry, that's a great thing but you're going to have to do it differently, because people care about how this system gets used. And I know that Jean-Guy is supportive of having healthy ecosystems, it's just that there are going to be bloody tough decisions to be made, and we are going to have to make them together and we may as well start getting used to it.

Mark Butler (Ecology Action Centre): Thank you, Kees, for that eloquence. In response to that and to the last question, what's in it for us?, I think none of us want a repetition of the collapses of so many stocks around Atlantic Canada, yet when I get some calls from people, from fishermen from Newfoundland, from Cape Breton and they tell me stories, I get a sense that we could do it again – that with the shrimp we might be doing it again. That as there's signs of groundfish recovery in the Gulf, that certain players are perhaps set on doing just exactly what they did 15 years ago. And that's pretty sad. Also, in the oil and gas industry and maybe we've raised the bar a little bit, but I still see the same thinking that was perhaps prevalent in the fishing industry 15 years ago prevalent in the way we're managing oil and gas. The economics come first. So, but the economic cost of the collapse of the fisheries was enormous and I don't think if economies collapse in Atlantic Canada again, I don't think we are going to see another infusion of billions of dollars to help us out.

Mike Butler (ACZISC): LOMAs and community of practice, two words that you are more than familiar with. I am just wondering how much liaison and communication there is between ESSIM, GOSLIM in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and Placentia Bay. Is there any relationship? Is there a community of practice there? Does one benefit from the other?

Joe Arbour (DFO): There is certainly a fair amount of interchange in terms of the Oceans staff between these various projects, but Mike raises a very good point and I would think we would want to see that as these initiatives mature that it's not only the interaction amongst the staff as the planning office but amongst all of the people involved in the Forum here and to see an exchange between this initiative and others as they mature in Canada. And I'm sure that will happen, this one is clearly out ahead of other activities in Canada but others are moving along quickly, so as they do and as they mature, I think that is a part of the effort that we can build in to the overall coordination is to ensure that we build those linkages between these and that there is an opportunity to share. There are individuals from other regions of DFO who are engaged in those projects here with us, and certainly they are quite welcome to jump up to a microphone and add to this, but we do have this interchange going on and will continue to do that and build on it.

Faith Scattolon (DFO): The other point I wanted to make to follow on with Joe's comment, and I think that Kees can probably back me up here, a lot of what we'll try to do with ESSIM and references in the draft management plan talk about ecosystem-based objectives. And I think that one of the areas where DFO has gotten and is continuing to get its act together and is a very positive contribution to the question that you asked, Mike, is in the area of the science foundation and making sure that the approaches that Science is taking in terms of developing ecosystem objectives, in terms of assessing ecosystems, which is kind of the underpinning for all of this work, is in fact being done in a consistent way across the country. So I just wanted to add that point, because I think it's very important.

Mike Butler (ACZISC): Thank you, Faith. And that concludes the panel session and I would like to thank our panellists for their enlightenment, we enjoyed your presentations, and the audience for participating, and Joe and DFO for inviting us. Thank you very much.

Small-Group Discussion on the Collaborative Planning Model

The proposed Collaborative Planning Model has the following institutional components: the ESSIM Forum; the Stakeholder Roundtable; the Government Sector Structure; and the Planning Office. Pages 15–21 of the draft ESSIM Plan provides background information relevant to this discussion. Participants considered the following questions:

- In general, how does the Collaborative Planning Model look to you?
- What do you like about the proposed model? What strengths do you see in it? What elements or aspects do you think are most important?
- What could be improved by using a different approach, principle or design factor? Is anything missing? How could the proposed model be improved?
- What challenges exist within your sector to participating on the Stakeholder Roundtable and how might those challenges be resolved to provide effective representation?

Synthesis of Facilitators' Consolidated Notes

Although not viewed as perfect, the collaborative planning model was generally considered to be sound. Positive comments related to its inclusiveness and participatory process with opportunities for stakeholders to discuss broader issues. The sharing of the decision-making mandate by DFO was viewed as positive. Critical comments related to the complexity of ensuring full inclusiveness. Some participants felt that there were too many layers, too many government representatives, and that it was overly bureaucratic. Public acceptance of change will be a challenge.

Model requirements included needs for transparency, shared responsibility, flexibility, credibility, and user-friendly language. Resources and financial support are required for stakeholders to participate. Commitment by all partners, including decision makers, DFO Headquarters and participants, is important. Decision-making roles need clarification and more detail is needed on the Terms of Reference, e.g., on the enforcement component. Existing institutions need to be recognized by the planning process. Goals and timelines should be set via action plans. A chart or diagram would help show links in the model. Information flow should be continuous with multiple media used and information from government meetings should be publicly accessible. It was questioned whether the model could advance without full participation. It was suggested that the model link to users outside the area and that the process be monitored.

In terms of representation, sectoral representation on the SRT is considered a strength because it allows for the identification of common ground. Omissions in SRT representation included women's groups and the ecotourism sector. Participation on the SRT by Aboriginal representatives, and federal, provincial and municipal governments was considered important. It was suggested that criteria be used to define who is / is not a stakeholder. Political representation in the planning model was also raised. The Federal-Provincial ESSIM Working Group should include municipal government representation.

With respect to the Regional Committee on Ocean Management (RCOM), concerns exist about senior-level official buy-in. The role of RCOM requires clarification in terms of where it fits within existing senior-level structures. It was stated that RCOM cannot change stakeholder recommendations, only

endorse them or seek further work. If RCOM is regional, how will the provinces be incorporated? It was suggested that RCOM needs to formalize commitment for power sharing and resource sharing.

Many comments were received on the Stakeholder Roundtable. These included the need to ensure that recommendations are implemented and that funding be provided for sectoral participation as well as for stakeholders who are not supported by a specific sector. Concerns with the SRT for some participants relate to participation by government regulators, that it have sufficient capacity and resources to support implementation, that it may undermine existing processes or cause burnout, and that it may be too large. Questions relate to how recommendations from SRT go to RCOM and how participation/composition will adapt to issues being addressed. To clarify the mandate, is the role of the SRT for general feedback or direct recommendations? The purpose for the selection of Citizens-at-Large needs clarification. The need to ensure continuity when the membership rotates was stressed.

Stakeholders have a responsibility to ensure representation on the SRT and it is important to get the right mix. Suggestions included elected representation on the SRT and attendance by observers and alternates. Representatives should be accountable for their performance. Communication mechanisms between the SRT and the sectors need clarification. The SRT could break into small working groups of experts for task work to provide opportunities for discussion away from government. Would secret ballots be used if consensus is absent?

Specific challenges relate to the risks of stakeholder burnout and getting full representation vis-à-vis the wide diversity within some sectors. In cases of non-consensus, some sectors may fear being under-represented or buried on the SRT. The fishing industry is challenged by the time-consuming nature of the process and by attending multiple meetings. There is a need to convince industry and other stakeholders that it is good for them to participate. Consolidation and capacity building of industry groups may be necessary so that they can participate in a meaningful way. Some considered the fact that ESSIM is not a priority for some sectors as a challenge. Government representatives need support and empowerment to participate.

The ESSIM Planning Office plays a critical role and is considered a strength. It needs the resources to show progress on short-term goals. The Planning Office should think about knowledge transfer and locally focused outreach. It should consider inter-departmental involvement and other participants for support. A community map to determine key players would be useful.

It was suggested that the ESSIM Forum builds the vision, while the SRT delivers on that vision. The ESSIM Forum needs natural and social science support, as well as support for traditional ecological knowledge. The full Forum should be utilized for input, not just the SRT representatives. The ESSIM Forum should delegate tasks to the SRT.

Overview of the Coral Conservation Plan, Maritimes Region, 2005–2010

Heather Breeze, Oceans Management Section, Oceans and Coastal Management Division

Many coral species are found off Nova Scotia, mostly in deep offshore areas. Conservation and research efforts on Atlantic Canadian corals started in the late 1990s and conservation measures are in place to protect corals in three areas: the Northeast Channel and Lophelia Coral Conservation Areas, and the Gully Marine Protected Area.

In October 2004, DFO held a workshop to gather content for a Coral Conservation Plan. Other discussions, such as with the corals working group of the Scotia-Fundy Fishing Industry Roundtable, have als[illegible]to the plan. The draft coral conservation plan was prepared to document what has been done to [illegible]t forward a more comprehensive approach on coral conservation; to identify issues w[illegible]ded, including future research needs; and to build collaboration among a variety [illegible]ral conservation. The plan will apply to multiple sectors and the scope includes [illegible]gion. The focus is on the more sensitive coral species that are found in deep offsh[illegible].

The Coral Conservation Plan is considered part of the overall ESSIM Plan and is based on the ESSIM vision, guiding principles and objectives. The conservation and management of benthic communities is a key component of the ESSIM Initiative and the ESSIM Plan includes several objectives related to benthic communities. The draft Coral Conservation Plan proposes *objectives*, *strategies* and *actions* for conservation, management and research. These are closely linked to the overall ESSIM plan, but are more specific to corals. The focus for the plan is to conserve the health and integrity of coral communities.

The Coral Conservation Plan describes several key issues that influence how conservation is implemented. These are:

- the sensitivity of corals to human activities
- the lack of information and research on cold-water corals, particularly as this relates to management
- the impact of conservation efforts on human activities
- decision-making related to coral conservation.

Lack of information and research on cold-water corals has consistently been identified as an issue that makes it difficult to manage coral conservation appropriately. The potential impact of coral conservation on human activities, e.g., fishing, has been raised as an issue and it is important to consider coral conservation in the context of other conservation activities.

The plan provides guidance on decision making for coral conservation, as many people have an interest in how conservation decisions are made and want to be involved in future conservation decision-making. The proposed approach to the management of corals includes integration into existing management processes, taking flexible and adaptive approaches to decision making, and collaboration.

To meet the objectives, general strategies and more specific actions have been proposed for the life of the plan (2005–2010). The proposed actions are described in terms of current or past activities, lead and supporting organizations, affected sectors, timeline/status, and priority.

Several high priority strategies and actions identified in the plan relate to the existing conservation areas, the identification and protection of additional important coral areas, and to information on corals. In terms of the conservation measures already in place, the Coral Conservation Areas and the Gully Marine

Protected Area are being incorporated into ocean use planning and management processes. Activity monitoring and surveillance of the Coral Conservation Areas and the Gully Marine Protected Area will continue.

A second high priority action is a two-part action – identifying important coral areas, and protecting those that are evaluated as important. The draft coral plan suggests an evaluation process to determine whether or not a site is important and should be protected. This evaluation process is a series of steps to evaluate the value and sensitivity of the site and to provide opportunities for consultation. Other priorities are to provide opportunities for input to decision-making on coral conservation and to provide information on corals and coral conservation, particularly to affected activity sectors.

Priorities for research are aimed at assisting conservation and management activities, including securing funding for benthic habitat and cold-water coral research, conducting research to evaluate the effectiveness of existing conservation measures, conducting research on impacts of human activities on corals, and identifying important coral areas in the region. Capacity building is still required to conduct deep-water surveys (> 500 metres).

DFO is soliciting comments on the draft plan in the spring of 2005 and a feedback sheet is available with the plan. All workshop participants with an interest in coral conservation activities are encouraged to pick up a copy of the plan and provide comments. The plan will be presented to the Scotia-Fundy Fishing Industry Roundtable and the Atlantic Canada Coral Initiative, as well as to other groups on request (e.g., the ESSIM Stakeholder Roundtable, when established), with consultations finishing by mid-June and a final plan completed in the summer.

An interim plan approval process is proposed for the regulators directly involved in the plan. All regulators and sectors will play a role in Plan implementation, while the ESSIM Planning Office will coordinate and facilitate the process. It is proposed that the plan be revised every 5 years and future plans may focus more broadly on benthic habitat.

Overview on the ESSIM Planning Office Work Plan, 2005–2006

Tim Hall, Oceans Management Section, Oceans and Coastal Management Division

The ESSIM Planning Office is housed within the Oceans and Coastal Management Division (OCMD), Oceans and Habitat Branch, DFO Maritimes Region. The Planning Office provides leadership and expertise in planning, plan development and implementation, and overall coordination and support for the ESSIM Initiative. The Planning Office also coordinates internal and external departmental liaison for oceans and coastal management.

Planning Office staff and their responsibilities include the following: Joe Arbour (oceans program management); Heather Breeze (deep sea corals and risk assessment); Scott Coffen-Smout (government and fisheries liaison); Derek Fenton (species at risk, marine protected areas); Tim Hall (project management); Glen Herbert (plan development and marine operations); Paul Macnab (Gully management and oil and gas liaison); and David Millar (First Nations and community liaison). Project support within OCMD includes logistics and administration.

The ESSIM Planning Office is *actively leading* in the following strategies and actions as outlined in the draft ESSIM Plan:

- Strategy 5: Develop and implement benthic ecosystem and habitat protection strategies
  - Action 3: Develop and implement a regional coral conservation plan
- Strategy 6: Develop and implement a regional marine protected areas system plan
  - Action 2: Complete management plan and related measures for the Gully MPA
- Strategy 11: Build long-term collaborative planning process for the Integrated Management Plan
  - Action 1: Establish collaborative planning model
  - Action 1.1: Form Stakeholder Roundtable
  - Action 1.2: Form Regional Committee on Ocean Management
  - Action 1.3: Develop principles for consensus and decision-making
  - Action 2: Develop action planning process for implementation of the Integrated Management Plan

The ESSIM Planning Office is *actively engaged* in the following strategies and actions as outlined in the draft ESSIM Plan:

- Strategy 1: Develop and implement an objectives-based framework for sustainable human use
  - Action 1: Human use objectives and indicators
- Strategy 2: Identify, manage and avoid spatial and/or temporal conflicts involving multiple users
  - Action 4: Assess spatial/temporal management measures
  - Action 4.1: Assess effectiveness of current measures
  - Actions 5–8: Evaluate and provide recommendations for regulators and industry to address interactions
- Strategy 3: Develop and implement an objectives-based marine ecosystem management and conservation framework
  - Action 1: Develop ecosystem objectives
  - Action 1.1: Undertake regional ecosystem assessment
  - Action 1.2: Collect information to develop indicators and reference points
  - Actions 3–3.2: Ensure fishing plans incorporate ecosystem objectives
- Strategy 4: Identify ecologically, biologically and geologically significant areas for use in planning, assessment and decision-making
  - Action 1: Finalize regional and national criteria
  - Action 2: Identify areas, and make recommendations on appropriate management actions
- Strategy 5: Develop and implement benthic ecosystem and habitat protection strategies
  - Action 1: Develop benthic characterization framework
  - Action 2: Assess human activities and impacts against framework
- Strategy 6: Develop and Implement a regional marine protected areas system plan
  - Action 1: Coordinated federal marine protected area planning
- Strategy 7: Develop and implement recovery strategies for aquatic species at risk
  - Action 1: Develop and implement recovery strategies, plans and measures
- Strategy 9: Develop and implement strategies to minimize impacts from sources of acoustic energy in the marine environment
  - Action 1.2: Complete Gully MPA seismic protocol
- Strategy 12: Develop frameworks for performance monitoring, reporting, compliance promotion and accountability for the Integrated Ocean Management Plan
  - Actions 2–2.2: Incorporate the plan in departmental planning and performance reporting
  - Action 4: Develop a set of decision rules for integration of human use and ecosystem objectives
- Strategy 13: Develop mechanisms for improved ocean awareness and information sharing

  - Action 2: Support public reports on ocean management issues
- Strategy 14: Increase opportunities for intergovernmental and interdepartmental cooperation for cross-cutting regional ocean management-related issues
  - Action 4: support initiatives for improving regulatory processes
  - Action 5: support interdepartmental coordination for strategic planning

The ESSIM Planning Office is to continue its coordination and leadership role and would appreciate hearing about any major gaps in the strategies and actions outlined. The Planning Office is interested to learn about what other organizations are able to commit to in the context of actions to implement these management strategies. The Planning Office remains open to hear what stakeholders think about the ESSIM planning process and its direction.

Small-Group Discussion on Action Planning

The Plan contains a set of management strategies and associated actions for integrated management in the planning area (see pages 49–63). The management strategies, actions and commitments are designed to contribute both directly and indirectly to the broader ecosystem and human use objectives for the Plan. Participants considered the following questions:

- How do the management strategies and actions contained in the Plan look as a basis for moving forward with integrated management? Are there strategies and/or actions that should be added, removed or changed in some way?
- How does the format used to organize and present the strategies and actions look to you? Are there changes that should be considered?
- Does the use of shorter term (2–3 year) action plans to support implementation of the longer term (5 year) Plan make sense to you? If not, how else might it be done?
- Identify the key actions that should be pursued through the ESSIM Initiative in the next 12–18 months.

Synthesis of Facilitators' Consolidated Notes

In general, participants noted that while this section of the plan was dense, the level of detail varied across the strategies and actions, i.e., the ecosystem conservation strategies and actions were more specific than those for multiple human use. The actions should be prioritized in a matrix of human use / ecosystem objective interactions to identify priorities. Resources (e.g., financial, human, data) will be essential for their implementation. It was noted that the allocation of resources requires commitment.

It is important to clarify the links between the strategies and actions and the objectives in the plan, as well as their linkages with the roles in the collaborative planning framework, i.e., who does what? It was suggested that the implementation approach may vary depending on the proposed use or users. Strategies and actions should focus on all sectors equally, i.e., avoid the focus on DFO. It was noted that uniform rules for all users are essential and that duplication of actions by multiple parties should be avoided.

It was stated that the plan should include specific strategies for pursuing human use objectives and that a strategy for community well-being and economic well-being should be added. There should be strategies to address impacts of ecosystems on human health (e.g., red tide). The following strategy was added: "Encourage local initiatives that are compatible with overall ESSIM Framework." It was suggested to make Strategy 13, Action 3.1 short-term and more action-oriented – "Examine barriers to information and data sharing and make recommendations for improvement." Strategy 2 – "Identify, manage and avoid

spatial and/or temporal conflicts involving multiple users" – should be reworded to "reduce conflict" rather than "avoid."

On the format and organization, the tabular format was well organized and useful for compiling and presenting a large amount of information. Some participants found the three themes (i.e., multiple use, conservation, and collaborative planning) somewhat confusing. Several suggestions were made including: the last three columns could be improved; "relevant sectors" and "all sectors" should be clarified; list affected sectors hierarchically; identify the resources required for each strategy; combine actions where possible; include timelines with intended start date and completion date for all actions; organize by short-, medium-and long-term actions, or by lead organization; summarize the strategies at the beginning of the table; and draw linkages to other initiatives in a flow chart (e.g., links to the Regional Advisory Process or the Species at Risk Program). There is a need to clarify terminology, e.g., "underway" is too unspecific, "percent completed" would be more useful, and clarify short-, medium-, long-term, and initiated, etc.

Regarding the use of short-term action plans as an implementation mechanism, action plans were viewed as a good way to start and support implementation. It was noted that the role of the SRT with respect to action planning should be clarified. Suggestions included: all sectors should be engaged in the action planning process; harmonize with existing stakeholder processes where possible to avoid duplication; produce a comprehensive but adaptive 5-year plan that can be modified and reported on annually and posted online; plan lifespan should be indefinite with 5-year reviews and 1, 2, and 3-year actions; use a business planning approach, with performance reviews and indicators; and commitment is needed beyond 5 years.

Recommended key actions for the next year are that DFO finalize and move ahead with the collaborative planning model and develop the SRT. One group suggested an Interim SRT be established soon and that more input from stakeholders be provided before establishing the permanent SRT. Another group suggested using the Coral Conservation Plan to test the SRT. It was recommended that DFO confirm the boundaries of the planning area and include the coastal zone.

Other key recommended actions include: popularize the documents and conduct active outreach to engage stakeholders and communities; move towards tangible outcomes to generate confidence and create momentum; demonstrate the benefits of ESSIM within 3–5 years, and celebrate and communicate the successes; link ESSIM to the *Oceans Action Plan*; incorporate the conflict negotiation document into the collaborative planning model; prioritize ecosystem research requirements; apply ecosystem objectives to all ocean users; continue work on zoning and MPAs; present a revised plan to stakeholders, get approval, and integrate the feedback; and conduct a critical path analysis.

In terms of identifying priority actions, they include starting with actions A1-A4 (N.B. The Strategy was not stated here). Other priority actions include: Action 1 for Strategies 1 through 5, Action 1.1 for Strategy 2, Action 4 for Strategy 2, and Action 3 for Strategy 3 (see pages 50–55 of the draft ESSIM Plan).

3.0 FINAL PLENARY DISCUSSION

Closing Reflections and Impressions: The 3rd Forum Workshop and the Path Ahead

Bruce Cameron (NS Energy): I've been involved on various levels in ESSIM for the last while. My first introduction was coming to the last ESSIM Forum a couple of years ago, the last one in 2003; and then being involved in the Federal-Provincial Group as we've tried to get ourselves to where we are today. My overwhelming impression is that even though I've been involved in seeing bits and pieces, this has been a tremendously useful exercise over the last couple of days to see it all come together. So that's number one. By spending a couple of days looking at it systematically, you then come to the conclusion of – Oh my God! – what a lot of work is on the plate here. When you sit down and we got to the last couple of hours and looked at the strategies and all the actions that are part of it, the work ahead is just tremendous. And I've been involved in a similar exercise for our Nova Scotia Department of Energy when we've developed an Energy Strategy and had a whole series of objectives and things that we had to monitor and work on, and I have a very clear idea of the magnitude of the task of keeping track of all these things that we're undertaking. And I also am involved in some of the actions that are referenced in the document here, and I understand the depth of commitment and work on an individual action.

You're looking at 14 different strategies with I don't know how many actions because I haven't added them all up. But when I understand just one activity that we're involved in and how many weeks and weeks of work and teleconference calls and discussions and getting in public engagement and so on and so forth, there is a tremendous amount of work that is here. So first of all, I want to acknowledge my realization of how much we've bitten off through the discussions here. And also my overwhelming impression is let's get the multi-stakeholder committee going because we're finding that we can't stop, these things need to get moved on, they are moving on. And it would have been better had that stakeholder process existed a little while ago. It's everyday that goes by without that group of people to start running these ideas by, get some input from, feedback on, then the further we can move forward. There's a lot of work here. The top priority is let's move on to have a process to have people give feedback on all these actions and plans, and that's my overwhelming impression. I would say right now, I think we're doing great. The folks at DFO have been involved in planning this exercise, my collaboration on it has been a small piece of the work that they're doing, and I would say, well done, let's move forward.

Dick Carson (DFO Pacific Region): I was wondering why Joe had originally asked me and I was actually coming to the presumption that the reason why he would ask me to speak to you today was because of the fact that I'm from the West Coast and therefore by definition I wouldn't know anything about what you're dealing with. So appreciate that opening comment. The other reflection that comes with this is that we have been able to do some work together with the Province of BC and we've ended a period of time that took us into a repeated set of battles over specific territory and issues, and have come to some agreements and conclusions that are leading to sub-agreements. The other perspective that I had on things was that Faith had repeatedly told me over a period of years that life was so much simpler on the West Coast – you're only dealing with one province.

So I've had opportunity and time to reflect on that during the course of the day as well and to see where things are taking you. It's quite apparent from what I heard this morning and what I learned through the course of this afternoon that you're sitting on a threshold and you're at the point where you're really starting to tackle some of the difficult issues, the really tough ones that are now going to come with forming a Roundtable and how to address that critical question of where does the decision making happen. That for me was another reflective point that took me back a couple of years ago to a room where I was sitting with our former Speaker of the House, former Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, former Ambassador for the Environment, John Fraser, and he posed that difficult question of who makes the

decisions, where does it meet the road, where does this all come together? And Joe and I had a bit of an opportunity to talk about that and it's quite apparent and it has been apparent to me in any roundtable, multi-stakeholder processes that I've had the opportunity to participate in during my career, that that critical point becomes one of the most key deciding stages of where you go and what you do. One of the things that needs to happen with it is that those who do have a decision-making capacity in government in the marine environment have to be part of that process in one form or another. And I heard the cautionary position that was being brought forward by a few and whether or not that capability is there.

I wasn't able to join you yesterday, but I came from two days of meeting together with other federal department agencies who are now struggling with that picture of how they are going to be a part of this *Oceans Action Plan*, especially with the fact that it's going to be driven over the next two years and has to produce results and has to produce deliverables. When you talk about the integrated management picture and the fact that when you look across the country there are five of these currently engaged at the present time, ESSIM will be the one that will determine that picture of how the stakeholder process works, how you grapple with that question of decision making. The others aren't there yet. They are going to be coming, but we haven't got that much time within two years to demonstrate the action of where we could go. I'd really encourage you to try to see if you can come to terms with that, and in addition to that we're trying to work at the national end at this point in time to try to bring together capabilities for that engagement by Natural Resources, by Industry, by Transport, by Environment, and by Fisheries and Oceans, to bring that part of the picture together, at least at the federal level. And I'd hope that that same level of engagement and capability is going to be able to be there as you need it from the provinces then where things are going to take you.

Just a final point in terms of some reflective thoughts on what we're dealing with and where things are going in terms of the marine environment, and I think often we don't really realize just how much change is happening. It intrigued me not too long ago as a Vancouverite to find out that the port of Vancouver is maxing out in its capability to handle container capacity. It will grow apparently over the next decade by roughly another 25 to 50 percent, but it's reaching that limit. One of the thoughts that is currently coming about with what is probably destined to be the next world superpower, China, and Asia-Pacific Rim trade, is the thought that we will have super container ships that will be transferring cargo around through the port of Halifax and bringing them in from the Pacific Rim region to deliver into Canada and to other points in North America. And when that happens, some of the discussion that's surrounding that is the fact that there may be a capability in the not too distant future to make that transit through the Northwest Passage. That's a bit of a sobering image and a sobering picture. Another thought that you might have in your mind is that the year 2007–08 is the International Polar Year and there is going to be an increasing focus on the north, in the Arctic and where we go. And a lot of that is going to be in the marine environment, and the fact that we have an obligation, those of us who sit in this room and other places, who know something about the marine environment, and who know how much there is out there in terms of demands and requirements for more Canadians to understand how significant our oceans are. An Environics poll that was conducted about four years ago concluded that only 30 percent of Canadians actually believe that they live in a maritime nation. That's pretty sobering. The other flip side of that same poll was that 80 percent of those who were polled believe that our oceans are important, but they don't know why. And we obviously got to bring that point across so that it isn't just clichés, it isn't just a bunch of things that they may have picked up, that you know, the oceans are polluted and there aren't as many fish as there used to be and a few other things, and bring the significance home to them of why our oceans are so critically important.

One other specific example that I'd like to give to you which I found remarkable when I started to learn about it, is that on the west coast of Canada everybody has heard about the Alaska cruise ship industry. That industry for over a period of years became inundated by pressures about its environmental responsibility and what it was going to do. Roughly 50 percent of the ships that are now plying the

waters between Vancouver and the glacial areas up in Alaska now have quaternary treatment systems on them. So in effect they're producing drinking water quality out of the far end of their black water and grey water systems that they are bringing in. They have full environmental systems onboard where they are compacting aluminium cans and bringing them out in bails, they are bringing out bailed paper products, they are dealing with things that are generated onboard the ship like dry cleaning liquids and photo processing and other things and dealing with them as properly treated chemical and containered systems. So obviously change is happening and the only reason that I bring that up as a case example is, where the rules are clear and where they are known to industry, by and large industry responds and goes beyond the basic standards and the expectations. And I say that having worked a career with Fisheries and Oceans and having worked at one time also with a fishing industry where the entire fleet on the west coast met a minimum standard in terms of fish hold compliance and fish quality standards. And I think there is that capability within the industry for us to get there. I'm going to end my thoughts on those points and just ask that you carry on. We're going to need this process in the next 2 years because we have to demonstrate what we have achieved under the *Oceans Action Plan*. And I'm convinced after today that you have the capability of doing that. Thank you.

Open Microphone Session: Closing Thoughts and Comments

Mark Butler (Ecology Action Centre): Just to reiterate what Bruce Cameron said earlier even though I'm sure we are going to find all kinds of flaws with it, but take the Stakeholder Roundtable and take this whole process for a test drive. And choose something like the coral conservation plan, for example, and try it out and see what happens, and then you only find out whether the basic collaborative planning model is going to work. A question I was going to ask had to do with the next Forum. When is the next Forum planned and can it, to engage people outside of Halifax, be in a place like Antigonish or Port Hawkesbury?

Joe Arbour (DFO): I knew there would be a question that I couldn't answer. Can you? (to Tim Hall) Next year. We haven't set dates at this point for it. We would anticipate sort of similar times. I think the call that we try to get outside of the metro area is one that we're very sensitive to and perhaps we can do some polling to find out what works well for people. To some extent this is convenient for some and very inconvenient for others. As we did during this past year we ran several community forums in other areas and I think although the large forum will occur next year in the winter, there will be a number of things that are going to happen over the year and we can certainly see that those get distributed around the province as we go forward. But I hear you, Mark, it's a good suggestion.

Darren Williams (DFO): I'm with the Oceans Program in Ottawa for Fisheries and Oceans. I just want to indicate that I had heard a few comments about some concern over the opportunities to share information between what's happening here on the Eastern Scotian Shelf and what's happening in other parts of the country. I did want to indicate that indeed there are structures evolving, additional work is certainly required, but there are some structures like a Deputy Ministers' Committee on Oceans and Assistant Deputy Ministers' Committee on Oceans. There are a variety of working groups mostly with the DFO at this time. But I would suggest that this is a genesis. Certainly initiatives like ESSIM are very much leading the way and sort of putting the rubber to the road, or the boat to the water, in terms of bringing to Canada in general some greater recognition that this is the way forward, by starting to develop a lot of the concrete deliverables such as the draft plan, which I think is simply a brilliant piece of work and I would certainly like to congratulate the guys working down here. But as these structures start to come into being, I think people are starting to grasp this reality. One final comment would be to suggest very much that ESSIM is at the forefront. I personally have a role of conveying some of the models, some of the structures, some of the hard work that's being done here to other regional initiatives that are

underway across the country. Again, I'd like to congratulate this group. Please continue to forge ahead because you are very much playing a leadership role. Thanks.

Tana Worcester (DFO): I just wanted to say that I thought it was really encouraging to see a lot more presentations by non-DFO folks this year and the panel was much appreciated. I think it is a sign of our success that there is a growing commitment to this process and I would hope to see next year that even more direction was taken to have presentations and leadership by other agencies, industry and community groups. So, I think that is really encouraging.

John Sollows (Tusket River Environmental Protection Association): I'm not going to talk about environment – that's important, but I think on the governance side what ESSIM is trying to do is also important. I hope it succeeds. It could be important for other sectors, other government departments, the need for stakeholder participation in decision making. We had some talk at small table discussions that sometimes people at higher levels are so busy they can't give sufficient attention to all of the decisions they have to make. Maybe one outcome of this can be encouragement for delegating decisions to the lowest competent level to make the decisions. Another thing from this morning that I heard – Canadians are so damned nice – and yes this is true. It's good, we set an example for the rest of the world in that way to some extent, but also sometimes getting the message across, and I think what was mentioned this morning about sometimes some fishing practices, for example, may not be sustainable. The message needs to get out, but there still needs to be participation from all sides in terms of how to solve the problem. And another point I think I mentioned at the Queens County workshop – to the Planning Office, please don't be diplomatic about telling us that we have an obligation to give you feedback.

4.0 SYNTHESIS OF ESSIM RESPONSE SURVEYS

Was the agenda for the 3rd Forum Workshop appropriate? Were there important topics that were left out or topics included that should not have been? Was the balance between presentations and discussion appropriate?

Most participants were satisfied with the agenda for the Forum workshop and felt that it led to good discussions around the draft ESSIM Plan. Participants generally felt that the balance between presentations and discussions was appropriate and that the schedule had a logical flow. Participants noted that there were many other topics that could have been addressed, but most agreed that the number and scope of topics included was sufficient for a single workshop and that it would have be difficult to include more. A few participants recommended that more presentations from organizations outside of government be included in the future.

Did you feel that there was enough time during each session to address each topic adequately? Please comment on sessions that you found too long or too short.

Overall feedback affirmed that approximately the right amount of time was allotted for most sessions. While some groups felt rushed during the discussion sessions, others felt that there was adequate time for discussion and that extending these sessions would not have been productive. Some participants suggested that less time should be spent on introductions to sessions and speakers in future to allow more time for discussions and presentations, and several people emphasized the importance of avoiding repetition. Acknowledging the large amount of material that needed to be covered and the impracticality of extending the workshop, most participants felt the timing could not have been significantly improved.

Was the format for small-group discussion effective? Did you feel that you had the opportunity to fully express your opinions? What could be done to improve the small-group sessions?

Most participants were very satisfied with the small-group discussions and felt that they had ample opportunity to express their opinions. In particular, participants commented positively on the group size and use of different table assignments for each of the two days. A need for improvement was noted in terms of the sectoral diversity of participants in the discussions. Participants felt that greater input from the most affected sectors, such as the fishing industry, would have enhanced the discussion. Some participants suggested using multiple rooms in future for small-group discussions to allow for more space and to reduce the noise level. Others recommended that discussion questions be circulated to all participants in advance of future workshops for consideration.

How did you feel about the quality of the facilitation during the workshop? How could the facilitation be improved?

Almost all of the responses regarding the quality of facilitation were very positive and complementary to the facilitators. Most people felt that the facilitators did an excellent job of coordinating and stimulating discussions and keeping people focussed on the intended topics. Several participants suggested that in future each table should have both a facilitator and a reporter, so that the facilitator can focus fully on the discussion rather than trying to perform both tasks simultaneously. Others emphasized the need for facilitators to be knowledgeable but also unbiased, noting that even a semblance of bias should be avoided.

What were your favourite and least favourite parts of the workshop, and why?

The small-group discussions were widely identified as participants' favourite component of the workshop. Participants commented that the discussions were lively, engaging, and that they provided an excellent opportunity for participants to hear a range of opinions. The panel discussion was also identified as a high point, again because of the range of opinions and perspectives presented. Other participants particularly liked the poster and presentation session on the first day, acknowledging the value of integrating presentations from outside organizations. On the other hand, a few participants felt these presentations were somewhat off topic and detracted from the focus on the Plan. Participants emphasized the need to keep presentations throughout the workshop short and lively, and avoid repetition.

Were you satisfied with the workshop venue? What aspects could be improved (e.g., room size and layout, food service, facilities, accessibility).

There was general satisfaction with the venue for the Forum workshop, although a number of suggestions were made for improvement. Most participants found the location sufficient, the space adequate, and the food satisfactory. Some participants pointed out that Mount Saint Vincent is not particularly accessible to participants without cars and recommended considering an alternative location in future. Others found that the multipurpose room became crowded at times and suggested having more space for break-out discussions. The importance of having plenty of options for food and drinks (e.g., decaffeinated coffee, salads without meat) were emphasized, as was the need to regulate the temperature of the facility which many people found too cold.

Do you think that the Forum Workshop provides an effective mechanism for multi-stakeholder dialogue on important components of the ESSIM Initiative like the ESSIM Plan? Why or why not? What other mechanisms could be used?

Most participants who responded believed that the Forum Workshop was a good mechanism for multi-stakeholder dialogue, but that it should be complemented by other mechanisms and that more stakeholders should be engaged. Participants acknowledged the value of providing an opportunity for multiple sectors to assemble to discuss management issues, and liked the variety of mechanisms used at the workshop to capture stakeholder input. On the other hand, many participants pointed out that attendance at the workshop did not accurately reflect the diversity of sectors that have a stake in the initiative, and emphasized the need to engage communities and ocean users further. Others suggested that the workshop should be used to address more tangible management issues and that there should be more discussion led by groups outside of government.

What can be done to improve the workshop in future years?

Most of the recommendations for improvement of the workshop related to enhancing participation from underrepresented sectors. Many participants felt that the planning office should work actively to engage the public and bring more stakeholders to the table, especially industry (specifically fisheries), communities, and youth. Participants suggested engaging the media, using simpler language in ESSIM documents, holding more workshops outside of the Halifax area, providing funding and support to stakeholders where necessary, circulating reports on progress, and emphasizing the benefits of being involved. Other general suggestions in regards to the workshop included putting more emphasis on discussion, rearranging discussion groups more frequently, and having panel discussions at the beginning and end of the workshop.

5.0 NEXT STEPS

The 3rd ESSIM Forum Workshop represented the first step in the review process for the draft integrated ocean management plan. The next step in this process is to release the plan for further stakeholder and public review. In order to facilitate the review process, the ESSIM Planning Office will be developing a simplified overview of the plan that presents key components in a more readable format. The Planning Office will also be working towards the development of an initial Action Plan that will provide additional details on management strategies and actions outlined in the draft plan.

The formal review period for the draft plan will begin in May 2005, at which time the Planning Office will be distributing consultation materials to stakeholder groups and the broader public. Interested groups and individuals will be invited to provide input on the plan through written submissions, meetings with the Planning Office, and community workshops and public meetings planned for the fall of 2005. Any group or individual interested in discussing the plan is welcome to contact the Planning Office at any time to arrange a meeting.

During the spring and summer of 2005, the Planning Office will be working on the establishment of the Stakeholder Roundtable, a key component of the ESSIM Collaborative Planning Model. Letters will be issued to stakeholder networks in the near future soliciting nominations for Roundtable representatives. It is anticipated that an initial meeting of the Stakeholder Roundtable will be scheduled for September 2005. This meeting will predominantly focus on the process for the Stakeholder Roundtable, with another meeting to be scheduled for later in the year to review and further develop the draft plan.

Formal public review activities for the draft plan are slated to conclude by October 31st 2005, although the ESSIM Planning Office will continue to accept feedback on an ongoing basis. After the review is complete, the Planning Office will revise the plan in accordance with the input received and prepare a final draft for distribution. Based on the response to the revised draft, the Planning Office will endeavour to have the plan endorsed by all sectors and approved under the *Oceans Act* in 2006.

APPENDIX I: AGENDA

Day 1: February 22			
7:30-8:15	Optional Background Session for Newcomers: ESSIM Introduction and Overview. Hot drinks and muffins available.		Dining Hall
8:00-8:30	Registration		Terrace Area
8:30-8:50	Welcome, Housekeeping, and Agenda Review		Multipurpose Room
8:50-9:00	Introduction to the 3rd ESSIM Forum Workshop by Carol Ann Rose, Acting Regional Director of Oceans and Habitat.		Multipurpose Room
9:00-9:20	Opening Address by Neil Bellefontaine, Regional Director General, DFO Maritimes		Multipurpose Room
9:20-10:00	Overview of the draft Integrated Ocean Management Plan and Q&A		Multipurpose Room
10:00-10:30	Nutrition Break		Terrace Area
10:30-12:00	Small-group discussions: Vision, Scope of the Plan, and Planning Area		Tables & Rooms Assigned at Registration
12:00-12:30	Lunch (sandwiches)		Dining Hall
12:30-2:30	Poster Session (Please use this time to review the posters at your leisure. Formal presentations begin at 1:00pm)		Terrace Area
	Please choose between one of two presentation options for each 1/2 hour time slot between 1:00pm and 2:30pm:		
1:00-1:30	**A:** The Idea of Ocean Zoning – Report of an International Consultation in May, 2004	**B:** A Land Use Planning Strategy for Halifax Harbour	**A** = Multipurpose Rm. **B** = Don MacNeil Rm.
1:30-2:00	**A:** ESSIM Objectives on the Water: Planning for Multiple Uses	**B:** MARIS: A Tool for Comprehensive Maritime Traffic and Risk Assessment	**A** = Multipurpose Rm. **B** = Don MacNeil Rm.
2:00-2:30	**A:** Integrating Ecosystem Objectives into Fishery Management Plans	**B:** Sable Island Management	**A** = Multipurpose Rm. **B** = Don MacNeil Rm.
2:30-2:40	Developing Human Use and Ecosystem Objectives for the ESSIM Planning Area		Multipurpose Room
2:40-3:00	Ecosystem Objectives Presentation		Multipurpose Room
3:00-3:20	Human Use Objectives Presentation		Multipurpose Room
3:20-3:50	Open Mic Discussion on Human Use and Conservation Objectives		Multipurpose Room
3:50-4:50	Small-group discussions: Decision Rules for Integrating Human Use and Ecosystem Objectives.		Tables & Rooms Assigned at Registration
4:50-5:00	Day 1 Wrap-Up		Multipurpose Room
5:00-6:00	Reception. Cash bar.		Terrace Area

Day 2: February 23rd		
8:30-8:45	Reorientation and Introduction to Day 2	Multipurpose Room
8:45-9:25	Collaborative Planning Model Presentation and Q&A	Multipurpose Room
9:25-10:00	Panel Reflections on the Collaborative Planning Model	Multipurpose Room
10:00-10:30	Open Mic Questions and Comments for the Panel	Multipurpose Room
10:30-11:00	Nutrition Break	Terrace Area
11:00-12:00	Small-group discussions on the Collaborative Planning Model	Tables & Rooms Assigned at Registration
12:00-1:00	Lunch (hot)	Dining Hall
1:00-1:15	Draft Coral Conservation Plan Presentation	Multipurpose Room
1:15-1:30	Planning Office Interim Workplan Presentation	Multipurpose Room
1:30-3:00	Action Planning: Small-group discussions to develop a workplan for the next 12-18 months and identify priorities for the Initiative.	Tables & Rooms Assigned at Registration
3:00-3:20	Reflections and Impressions: The 3rd Forum Workshop and the Path Ahead	Multipurpose Room
3:20-3:40	Open Mic Session: Closing Thoughts and Comments	Multipurpose Room
3:40-4:00	Next Steps	Multipurpose Room
Adjourn		

APPENDIX II: WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS AND INVITED PERSONS

Tim	Anderson	Fisheries & Oceans, Newfoundland Region
Richard	Apostle	Dalhousie University
Joe	Arbour	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Maritimes Region
Diane	Beanlands	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Maritimes Region
Sue	Belford	Jacques Whitford Environment Ltd.
Neil	Bellefontaine	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Maritimes Region
Jacinta	Berthier	Dalhousie University
Jackie	Bird	Saint Mary's University
Jerry	Black	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Maritimes Region
William	Bond	Guysborough County Inshore Fishermen's Association
Dean	Bouchard	Halifax Port Authority
Valerie	Bradshaw	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Maritimes Region
Robert	Branton	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Maritimes Region
Heather	Breeze	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Maritimes Region
Tanya	Bryan	World Wildlife Fund, Atlantic Regional Office
Mark	Butler	Ecology Action Centre
Michael	Butler	Atlantic Coastal Zone Information Steering Committee
Bruce	Cameron	Nova Scotia Department of Energy
Dick	Carson	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, National Capital Region
Bruce	Chapman	Groundfish Enterprise Allocation Council
Tony	Charles	Saint Mary's University
Mireille	Chiasson	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Gulf Region
Chiu	Chou	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Maritimes Region
Kim	Coady	Canada-Newfoundland Offshore Petroleum Board
Scott	Coffen-Smout	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Maritimes Region
John	Coon	University of New Hampshire
Geoff	Coughlan	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, NL Region
David	Creber	National Defence
Ches	Cribb	Fish, Food and Allied Workers Union (FFAW)
Joan	Czapalay	Sable Island Preservation Trust
Tyson	Daoust	Saint Mary's University
Reade	Davis	Memorial University
Isabel	de Noronha	Center for Marine Policy, University of Delaware
Cameron	Deacoff	Dalhousie University
Andre	d'Entremont	Chevron Canada Resources
Jean-Guy	d'Entremont	Inshore Fisheries Ltd., West Pubnico
Daniela	Diz Pereira Pinto	Dalhousie University
Kim	Doane	Nova Scotia Department of Energy
Rod	Doane	Petroleum Research Atlantic Canada
Penny	Doherty	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Maritimes Region
Glen	Doucette	Office of the Auditor General
Sandra	Elvin	Dalhousie University
Lucia	Fanning	Environment Canada, Atlantic Region
Derek	Fenton	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Maritimes Region
Becky	Field	Dalhousie University

Gordon	Gale	International Trade Canada
Pramod	Ganapathiraju	Dalhousie University
Paul	Gentile	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Maritimes Region
Brian	Giroux	Scotia-Fundy Mobile Gear Fishermen's Association
Sherry	Glynn	Fish, Food and Allied Workers Union (FFAW)
Beverley	Grant	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Maritimes Region
Linde	Greening	Nova Scotia Department of Agriculture and Fisheries
Kent	Gustavson	Jacques Whitford Environment Ltd.
Tim	Hall	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Maritimes Region
Bruce	Hatcher	University College of Cape Breton
Chris	Hawkins	Triton Consultants
Carolyn	Hedley	Dalhousie University and CPAWS
Jen	Heintz	Dalhousie University
Glen	Herbert	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Maritimes Region
Bill	Hickey	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, NL Region
Darren	Hicks	Newfoundland and Labrador, Department of Mines and Energy
Laura	Higgins-Schlagel	National Defence
Larry	Hildebrand	Environment Canada, Atlantic Region
Patricia	Hinch	Nova Scotia Department of Environment and Labour
Cheryle	Hislop	University of Tasmania / Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution
Dick	Hodgson	Dalhousie University
Melanie	Hurlburt	Dalhousie University
Geoff	Hurley	Hurley Environment Ltd.
John D.	Hurst	Association of Maritime Arbitrators of Canada
Thierry	Husson	Industry Canada
Justin	Huston	Nova Scotia Department of Aquaculture and Fisheries
Tom	Kagi	Dalhousie University
Samuel	Kenyanya	Dalhousie University
Ibrahim	Khan	Dalhousie University
Mohammad	Khastagir	Dalhousie University
Kate	Killerlain	Coastal Zone Management, Massachusetts Office
Marty	King	World Wildlife Fund, Atlantic Regional Office
Ned	King	Natural Resources Canada
Friederike	Kirstein	Environment Canada, Atlantic Region
Lisa	Lachance	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, National Capital Region
Ivan	Lantz	Shipping Federation of Canada
Lyndon F.	Latorre	Dalhousie University
Gisele	Leblanc	Sable Island Preservation Trust
Bob	Lee	Atlantic Fiduciaries Ltd.
Geoff	Lewis	Industry Canada
Zoe	Lucas	Sable Island
Dan	Lundrigan	International Telecom Inc.
Garry	MacCaull	Transport Canada
Jane	MacDonald	Health Canada, Atlantic Region
Claire	MacDonald	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Maritimes Region
Alison	MacKenzie	Saint Mary's University
Paul	Macnab	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Maritimes Region

David	Marson	Dalhousie University
Derek	McDonald	Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency
Elizabeth	McGhie	Dalhousie University
Dawn	Mercer	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, NL Region
Colleen	Mercer Clarke	Coast Lands Consultants
Cathy	Merriman	World Wildlife Fund, Atlantic Regional Office
David	Millar	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Maritimes Region
Andrew	Montgomery	Metcalf & Company
Monique Anne	Morin	NB Dept. of Agriculture, Fisheries and Aquaculture
Md. Abul Hasan	Mridha	Dalhousie University
Suranga	Nandasma	Dalhousie University
Melissa	Nevin	Saint Mary's University
Sam M.	Ng'ang'a	University of New Brunswick
Nguyen Thi	Nhung	
Joan	O'Brien	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, NL Region
Eugene	O'Leary	Guysborough County Inshore Fishermen's Association
Susan A.	Otieno	Dalhousie University
Andy	Parker	Canada-Nova Scotia Offshore Petroleum Board
Amanda	Park	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Maritimes Region
Ron	Pelot	Dalhousie University
Kyle	Penney	National Defence
Gerard	Peters	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Maritimes Region
David	Pinsent	Jacques Whitford Environment Ltd.
Soonya	Quon	Parks Canada - Atlantic Service Centre
Robert	Rangeley	World Wildlife Fund, Atlantic Regional Office
Clary	Reardon	Nova Scotia Department of Agriculture and Fisheries
Aurora	Reid	Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers
Celeine	Renaud	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Maritimes Region
Jane	Rogers	Dalhousie University
Carol Ann	Rose	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Maritimes Region
Bob	Rutherford	Thaumas Environmental Consultants Ltd.
Faith	Scattolon	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Maritimes Region
Shannon	Scott-Tibbetts	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Maritimes Region
Victoria	Sheppard	Dalhousie University and CPAWS
Bruce	Smith	BLSmith Consulting Inc.
Jen	Smith	World Wildlife Fund, Atlantic Regional Office
Ken	Snow	Guysborough County Inshore Fishermen's Association
John	Sollows	Tusket River Environmental Protection Association
Bob	St-Laurent	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Maritimes Region
Anne	Sweeney	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Maritimes Region
Mark	Tekamp	Canadian Institute of Planners
Eric	Theriault	Canada-Nova Scotia Offshore Petroleum Board
Cynthia	Thornham	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Maritimes Region
Karen	Traversy	An Cala Consulting
Danny	Truen	Eastern Shore Fishermen's Protective Association
Beth	Vardy	Canada-Nova Scotia Offshore Petroleum Board
Jaime	Vickers	Dalhousie University
Jennifer	Voutier	Dalhousie University

Danny	Walmsley	Walmsley Environmental
Jay	Walmsley	Jacques Whitford Environment Ltd.
Gary	Walsh	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Maritimes Region
Roger	Wells	Halifax Regional Municipality
Sean	Weseloh McKeane	Dalhousie University
Max	Westhead	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Maritimes Region
Darren	Williams	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, National Capital Region
Gabrielle	Wint-Rose	Dalhousie University
Tana	Worcester	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Maritimes Region
Zijun	Xu	Dalhousie University
Kees	Zwanenburg	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Maritimes Region

APPENDIX III: INTRODUCTORY SPEECHES

Carol Ann Rose, Regional Director (Acting), Oceans and Habitat Branch, Maritimes Region

Good morning everyone and welcome. It's nice to see such a large group of keen people, many of you from within the Region and lots from across the country. We are certainly looking forward to your participation over the next two days and welcome you here to this 3rd Forum. It has been two years since the last ESSIM Forum Workshop and a lot has happened since that last workshop. One of the more important factors since the workshop was the Government of Canada's commitment to advance integrated management through the announcement in the recent Speech from the Throne to move forward on an *Oceans Action Plan*. At its core, the *Oceans Action Plan* is about achieving integrated management. It requires a stronger commitment to more fully involve all governments, aboriginal peoples, oceans industries and coastal communities in decision making. It also requires stronger leadership in support of ecosystem-based approaches to science to provide more comprehensive advice to improve how we manage marine environments.

We are now moving into Phase I of the *Oceans Action Plan* and there are five priority areas: the Queen Charlotte Basin, the Beaufort Sea, the Gulf of St. Lawrence, Placentia Bay and the Grand Banks, and the Scotian Shelf. Phase I requires immediate action to implement a series of key initiatives under the four *Oceans Action Plan* pillars. Those are four pillars and I will go through each one quickly. International Leadership, Sovereignty and Security, the primary areas for that pillar are the Arctic, Grand Banks and the Gulf of Maine. The second pillar is Integrated Management, as previously mentioned. The third pillar, Health of the Oceans, the national network of marine protected areas to follow the Endeavour hydrothermal hot vents and the Gully MPAs. The fourth pillar, Oceans Science and Technology, includes seabed mapping in the priority integrated management areas and promoting ecosystem science and oceans technology. These will set the foundations for advancing a more comprehensive oceans management agenda aligned with a longer-term objective for the *Oceans Action Plan*. Thank you.

Neil Bellefontaine, Regional Director-General, Maritimes Region

Good morning everyone and welcome to the 3rd ESSIM Forum Workshop of the Eastern Scotian Shelf Integrated Management (ESSIM) Initiative. I want to thank you for being part of a significant milestone in the 6-year history of the ESSIM Initiative. That milestone is that today we have a draft plan—the *Eastern Scotian Shelf Integrated Ocean Management Plan – A Draft for Discussion*. This is an important document to consider over what should be two very engaging days of discussion. I should note at the outset that my ADM of Oceans and Habitat, Sue Kirby, had planned to be here today. Unfortunately with the federal budget announcement tomorrow, most ADMs in government have been grounded in Ottawa to prepare for the outcomes of that budget. But I know that she is interested in this Initiative very much so and had intended to speak to you today, and I'm sure she'll watch to see the outcomes of the Forum.

The strong attendance here today is indicative of everyone's commitment to and support for this process. Your continued investment of time and your interest in this event will continue to build momentum for the ESSIM planning process. Once again, a broad diversity of stakeholders is represented at this workshop, but I am sure you will agree that everyone here has a common interest in and focus on the sustainability and well-being of the entire Scotian Shelf. And if you don't, you are here because you want to learn perhaps to apply it somewhere else.

The ESSIM Forum, of which you are all members, is an important collaborative mechanism for addressing critical ocean management issues, such as multiple ocean use, resource conservation, ecosystem protection, and community sustainability. As part of your expected ongoing involvement in this process, one of your roles is to provide input to help shape the development and implementation of the draft ocean management plan so that these priority issues are integrated together into the planning process.

Integrated ocean management is indeed a transformation in the way we operate, both as ocean users and as regulators. Implementing an integrated management and planning process has some transaction costs in terms of time for coordination and the participation required to achieve program coherence within a department like DFO, between government departments, and with all users of the ESSIM area. Before DFO can effectively collaborate

with ocean users, there has been the need to achieve strong internal coordination and cooperation, and I will speak to our departmental achievements in that regard in a moment.

But first I want to emphasize that within an integrated management and planning process, accountability by all from the outset becomes a necessary condition for the achievement of the objectives of the plan. It is largely because of this "accountability paradox" in a collaborative planning process like ESSIM that we are all essentially accountable to the plan—so I'll remind you that this is Your Plan, not just DFO's plan!

You will probably recall that the last ESSIM Forum workshop was held in February 2003. The ESSIM Forum did not meet as a collective in February 2004 because DFO's ESSIM Planning Office required more time to work on the ecosystem and human use objectives frameworks in collaboration with two multi-stakeholder working groups. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the individuals from those groups for helping to develop the key plan components that will be outlined this afternoon in the session on objectives-based management.

The main focus of tomorrow's discussion will be on the Collaborative Planning Model, including the proposed Stakeholder Roundtable to be formed later this spring, and the development of a priority workplan to advance the Initiative. I hope that everyone critically reviews the elements of the draft plan and shares their views with others during the next two days. It is our hope that we may all collectively advance the implementation in order to achieve plan approval by the Minister under the *Oceans Act* in the winter of 2006. Note that future discussions on specific issues facing ocean management in our region will occur through proposed collaborative planning mechanisms such as the Stakeholder Roundtable.

As proposed in the Collaborative Planning Model, I will be leading the establishment this spring of the Regional Committee on Ocean Management (RCOM) in order to further enhance effective interdepartmental and intergovernmental relationships for ESSIM. It is our goal to form this executive-level intergovernmental committee to coordinate policy and regulatory affairs in the context of ESSIM and for other related ocean and coastal management initiatives. This Committee will comprise both federal and provincial levels of government engaged in the ESSIM process and it is hoped that at some point this include First Nations participation.

Within DFO Maritimes Region, I am pleased with the progress and efforts to date to build capacity to undertake integrated management throughout the Region. This work includes several initiatives and I will mention a few of them:

(i) In the spring of 2004, DFO Science Branch formed the ESSIM Science Working Group to advance the regional development of an ecosystem objectives and indicators framework that will be embedded in the ESSIM Plan – This work is supplementary to the good work done on ecosystem objectives by the multistakeholder working group I mentioned;

(ii) Both DFO and Natural Resources Canada are close to finalizing the benthic habitat classification model as a tool that will contribute to managing and protecting sensitive benthic habitats on the Scotian Shelf and in the Bay of Fundy;

(iii) The development of objective-based fisheries management plans is ongoing, and those plans will evolve to operationalize ecosystem and precautionary approaches to fisheries management; and finally

(iv) To make horizontal coordination a reality, DFO continues to improve the coordination of delivery of DFO programs regionally.

In DFO Maritimes Region we are continuing to build stronger working relationships with our partners in industry and in government. There are number of examples of how we have done this:

(i) The Federal-Provincial ESSIM Working Group has met on an ongoing basis since January 2001 for operational-level discussions, and has had considerable input into the collaborative planning model and the management strategies and actions as set out in the draft ESSIM plan;

(ii) A Working Group of the Scotia-Fundy Fishing Industry Roundtable has been engaged in cooperative efforts toward deep sea coral conservation on the Scotian Slope and provided advice on the design of management measures to protect corals. An ESSIM working group on corals formed last year to develop a Coral Conservation Plan for the Scotian Shelf and Slope. That plan will be discussed in more detail during tomorrow afternoon's session;

(iii) The ongoing interdepartmental cooperation between DFO and the Canada-Nova Scotia Offshore Petroleum Board under a joint Memorandum of Agreement, which was expanded to include the Gulf Region of DFO and Environment Canada last year, has resulted in effective interagency cooperation for the regulation of oil and gas activities; and

(iv) The multistakeholder Gully Advisory Committee is actively engaged in the ongoing management of our first east coast, offshore MPA.

I would now like to acknowledge the group that planned this workshop—the ESSIM Forum Workshop Planning Team, a multi-sectoral advisory group that met four times to discuss the objectives, format, agenda, and expected outcomes for this 2-day event. The Planning Team symbolizes the capacities and benefits of bringing various communities of interest together. A variety of perspectives and experiences helps to ensure that the workshop is effective, practical and responsive for all those involved. I would like to identify the Planning Team members for this year:

Beth Vardy, CNSOPB
Bruce Smith, BLS Groupwork Inc.
Cathy Merriman, WWF Canada
Douglas Duggan, Natural Resources Canada
Janet Trider, Seafood Producers' Association of Nova Scotia
Jay Walmsley, Jacques Whitford Environment Limited
Karen Traversy, An Cala Consulting
Kim Doane, Nova Scotia Energy Department
Mark Butler, Ecology Action Centre
Richard Apostle, Sociology and Social Anthropology, Dalhousie University

... as well as a number of staff from the Oceans and Coastal Management Division of DFO.

As I stated at the two previous ESSIM workshops, we are aware that not all ESSIM Stakeholders can afford the time to travel to Halifax for this event. I would like to note, however, that in response to recommendations from participants at the previous ESSIM Forum Workshops, the ESSIM Planning Office held six community workshops in late November 2004 to enhance coastal community participation in the ESSIM Initiative. Community workshops held in Liverpool, Ship Harbour and Port Hawkesbury provided an opportunity for members of coastal communities and other interested parties from across the province to learn more about the ESSIM Initiative and to provide input to the future integrated ocean management plan. Copies of the proceedings from these community workshops are available at the registration desk. And furthermore the ESSIM Planning Office will continue to hold workshops in coastal communities over the coming year.

In closing, I hope that the draft ESSIM Plan released for this workshop provides you with much to consider over the next two days. I would like to re-emphasize the strong commitment from DFO regionally and departmentally to the ESSIM process. This is a flagship integrated ocean management initiative not only for our region but for our country as a whole, and this meeting represents a critical juncture in the development of the Initiative. We want to ensure the success of this process and to deliver on Canada's oceans mandate. I think we all look forward to listening to today's discussions and to hearing the final outcomes of the meeting. And therefore I wish you all a very successful workshop. Thank you.

APPENDIX IV: PRESENTATION ABSTRACTS

The Idea of Ocean Zoning: Report of an International Consultation in May 2004

Bruce Hatcher, University College of Cape Breton
E-mail: bruce_hatcher@uccb.ca

In May 2004, a team of academics and practitioners hosted a workshop to examine the applicability of ocean zoning to the Scotian Shelf. The workshop looked at concepts of ocean zoning, specific cases where the practice of zoning has been applied, and perspectives from sectors of society that might be affected by zoning. The examination of ocean zoning is timely in that the *Oceans Act*, *Oceans Strategy*, and *Oceans Action Plan* all call for spatially explicit management measures. Furthermore, a number of ongoing initiatives already incorporate aspects of zoning in the management of human activities on the shelf (e.g., the establishment of marine protected areas).

The workshop began with presentations on the concept of ocean zoning. Hance Smith discussed the process of sea-use planning as it is applied in the North Sea and suggested that zoning is an inevitable step in the development of the oceans, much as it has been on land. His presentation identified the role of different organizations in the decision-making process and emphasized the need for protocols for engaging public and private sectors in a meaningful way. He also emphasized some of the challenges of working in international waters or overlapping jurisdictions.

Sue Nichols gave a summary of zoning practices on land and discussed their transferability to the ocean. She pointed out that the level of resources invested in land use planning in a given area is a function of the productive capacity of that area. The extent to which we invest in zoning on the Scotian Shelf should reflect the Shelf's capacity, but availability of resources may be a challenge. Sue saw zoning as one of several tools that could be used for the implementation of a 'master plan', and not as a stand-alone solution for managing ocean use. She emphasized the intense requirement for information, which may be difficult to fulfil. Sue also discussed why people zone and argued that all of the benefits of and justifications for zoning on land should apply in the ocean. Finally, she acknowledged the importance of considering human aspects of the ocean system in conducting zoning activities.

John Duff issued a note of caution about ocean zoning given the uncertain and complex jurisdictions involved. He emphasized that before we establish zones we need to know what will be included and excluded and who will be affected. He examined the components of ocean governance and argued that zoning is only one of many activities that must occur for effective governance, including planning, allocation of access, and enforcement. An important point that John raised was the continuum between the public and private property. No piece of space is entirely public or entirely private, but rather all pieces have characteristics of both. Zoning initiatives must recognize this continuum.

The next set of presentations looked at lessons drawn from experiences elsewhere. Ken Sherman from NOAA spoke about the large marine ecosystem (LME) program which has divided the entire globe into 64 LMEs. He explained the basis for defining LMEs and looked at the upscaling and downscaling issues involved in moving from very large marine ecosystems to smaller areas. According to Ken, it was quite easy to define boundaries for LMEs based on geomorphological and ecological characteristics. The more challenging step had been the paradigm shift from sector or species based management to ecosystem-based or integrated management. He argued that the same set of changes in assumptions and protocols that were required to get acceptance in the global scale for LMEs were transferable to the zoning of much smaller pieces of ocean space.

Billy Causey, the superintendent of the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary, explained the issues that they had faced in their area. One of the major lessons from his presentation was that governments respond to crisis. Only after a century of degradation did the government finally move forward with zoning of the Keys. He acknowledged the length of time required to implement zoning and also recognized that zoning was an ongoing process that would require continuous review and adaptation. He emphasized the importance of compliance, as distinct from enforcement, in achieving success from zoning.

Richard Kenchington presented a summary of the process by which the largest managed ocean space in the world, the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park, was zoned. The conclusion drawn from this exercise was that multiple-use

zoning in large, remote areas is feasible but requires a different approach to public participation. Sectoral management structures should not be disassembled, but should continue to operate in accordance with hard rules to avoid inconsistencies among them. Principles and guidelines were clearly seen as something that had to be developed at the outset through broad consultation. Long-term commitment was required, as were ongoing and thorough revisions of zoning plans.

Working groups then considered the experiences presented by the speakers and discussed their applicability to the Scotian Shelf. One group discussed whether specific legislation was needed to guide zoning on the Scotian Shelf, without reaching consensus. Another group discussed the situation in the Gulf of Maine, emphasizing the complexity of managing international waters and the importance of considering the watershed as part of the marine ecosystem. Another group discussed enforcement, considering the Florida experience, and concluded that voluntary compliance was essential. Yet another group discussed whether the global model for large marine ecosystems could be scaled down for smaller areas and concluded that this was possible, but that trying to scale up from smaller to larger areas might not be effective. A final group examined the role of science and concluded that while research in the natural sciences was necessary for management decision support of zoning, it was not sufficient, and there were also essential roles for the social sciences.

Following the reports from the working groups, representatives of some of the main ocean use sectors presented their perspectives in a panel presentation. All the sectors expressed a degree of willingness to entertain zoning as an approach to the management of ocean space, including their own activities. Likewise there was willingness from regulators to consider the approach.

The conclusions from the workshop were that zoning is one of several tools for ocean planning that should be used in concert; that zoning is a long-term process; that zoning has proven effective in terrestrial environments, and can work in ocean space if there is a serious commitment of resources and time. The workshop gave everyone a much better understanding of the concept and proven applications of ocean zoning. The participants were impressed with the examples from elsewhere, and recognized the potential for applications on the Scotian Shelf, while acknowledging the challenges involved.

The workshop proceedings are available at http://www.ecologyaction.ca/marine/oceanzoningproceedings.pdf.

ESSIM Objectives "On the Water" – Planning for Multiple Uses

Jen Smith, Robert Rangeley, Marty King, Cathy Merriman, Tanya Bryan, Ken Larade (WWF Canada)
E-mail: jsmith@wwfcanada.org

The draft ESSIM plan represents an opportunity to restore the health of the Scotian Shelf ecosystem and achieve a balance between conservation and human uses. Part of WWF-Canada's contribution to the ESSIM process has been to draw on the expertise within our global network in the application of spatial management tools that will be crucial to moving forward with a plan.

The draft ESSIM plan describes a set of objectives: the ecosystem objectives represent shared commitments to restoring and maintaining ecosystems on the Scotian Shelf, while the human use objectives lay out goals for enhancing the well-being of the human communities that are linked to the planning area. Several of these objectives require planning for the use of ocean space. Marine spatial planning tools, such as zoning, can be used to help achieve these objectives.

This presentation described an approach to zoning that balances ecosystem and human use objectives in a fair and transparent way. This approach builds a zoning scheme sequentially by first designating priority areas that are necessary for achieving ESSIM's ecosystem objectives, around which may be implemented other types of zoning that supports the human use objectives.

Implementing this approach would represent a significant step towards achieving the objectives and would provide a strong platform for other, non-spatial management measures. In addition to contributing to ecosystem restoration by implementing effective conservation measures, this approach to marine spatial planning benefits users by improving

our ability to deal with cumulative impacts and conflicts between uses, and by providing greater certainty for industry. This approach is consistent with lessons learned through several marine planning processes around the world. The ESSIM process is well positioned to draw on the experiences of these other jurisdictions.

Integrating Ecosystem Objectives into Fishery Management Plans

Claire MacDonald, Fisheries and Aquaculture Management Branch, DFO Maritimes Region
E-mail: MacDonaldCM@mar.dfo-mpo.gc.ca

Operationalizing integrated management processes poses many challenges for fisheries management. The intent is to provide a holistic view while framing it pragmatically against the conservation objectives and strategies of fishery management plans. This work will take time to accomplish and will involve cooperation and contributions from DFO Science, fisheries managers and oceans managers. This presentation is to illustrate where DFO is in this process of incorporating ecosystem objectives in fishery management plans.

An integrated fisheries management plan is both a process and a document. The primary goal is to provide a planning framework for the conservation and sustainable use of fisheries resources and the process by which a given fishery will be managed over a period of time. It allows for input by resource users and other stakeholders as well as DFO (i.e., Science, Oceans, Conservation and Protection, and Aboriginal Affairs). As a document, the plan provides valuable information (e.g., history, biology, management objectives, and measures to achieve objectives). Provisions of the plan determine how the fishery will be managed and what will appear in licence conditions.

DFO is incorporating ecosystem objectives into fisheries management plans because the Minister of DFO has an obligation to manage through an ecosystem-based approach. Canada's 1997 *Oceans Act* gave the legislative authority for fisheries management to include ecosystem considerations. As well, the passage of the *Oceans Act* is consistent with international approaches to sustainable management of resources.

The three overarching objectives considered necessary and sufficient for conservation include: to conserve enough components (ecosystems, species, populations, etc.) so as to maintain the natural resilience of the ecosystem; to conserve each component of the ecosystem so that it can play its historic role in the foodweb (i.e., not cause any component of the ecosystem to be altered to such an extent that it ceases to play its historical role in a higher order component); and, to conserve habitat in order to safeguard the 'container' (i.e., the physical and chemical properties) of the ecosystem.

In order to implement the overarching objectives they must be translated into more specific operational objectives. Strategies are then needed to define what will be done and measurement objectives are required to define how the strategies will be implemented. For example, the objective to maintain productivity of the population by managing exploitation and preventing growth over-fishing may be achieved through a strategy of keeping exploitation rates at moderate levels. This is achieved by controlling fishing mortality (F) through annual TACs at or below F0.1. The strategy to maintain biomass of each spawning component above a minimum threshold is achieved through implementing a "survey, assess and then fish" protocol and by controlling fishing mortality at or below F0.1.

At this point, we have broad ecosystem objectives in many of our management plans, but they have not been put into a framework, which is being worked on now by Science, Oceans, and Fisheries and Aquaculture Management. The ecological objectives reflected in fishery management plans will respond to the overall ecosystem approach and objectives as outlined in the ESSIM Plan.

Given the number of fisheries management plans all with varying expiration dates (e.g., the Herring Plan is for 2003–2006), we will take an evolutionary approach to incorporating ecosystem objectives into fisheries management plans. Some work has been done on the groundfish and herring plans, but we are still at the beginning of the process. Offshore lobster and scallop will be addressed next.

Operationalizing objectives involves restating them with greater specificity until the outcome constitutes the equivalent of a phrase that includes a management action, a measurable performance indicator and a reference point

for that indicator. The reference point for a performance indicator is a guidepost for decision making. There is much work to be done and scientific input is needed to identify performance indicators and reference points.

A Land Use Planning Strategy for Halifax Harbour

Roger Wells, Halifax Regional Municipality
E-mail: wellsr@region.halifax.ns.ca

Halifax Regional Municipality (HRM) is undertaking the preparation of a Regional Plan that will outline how HRM will grow over the next 25 years. It will address 4 main themes: the Economy, Settlement Pattern, Transportation, and the Environment. As part of the Regional Planning exercise, we are also preparing a long-range plan for Halifax Harbour. The Harbour Plan is a geographic sub-set of the Regional Plan. Halifax Harbour is a working harbour containing 2 world-class container terminals, general cargo terminals, shipbuilding and repair, offshore supply facilities, Navy and Coast Guard headquarters, and marine research facilities. The port generates c. 9,000 jobs in direct and indirect employment. Halifax is a multi-modal transportation centre, providing local, regional, national and international connections.

The waters and shoreline of Halifax Harbour have been instrumental in growing HRM's tourism industry. Visitation by cruise ships has quadrupled since 1997, with some 120 vessels visiting in 2004. There is a growing demand for harbour-front living and this trend is expected to continue. Halifax Harbour is a living environmental ecosystem, supporting diverse marine plant and animal habitat, including a small commercial fishery. Human activities have deteriorated this habitat, and it is important that as future development occurs, the environmental integrity of the harbour is maintained and improved. The ongoing Harbour Solutions Project and Source Control Program will improve the quality of water entering the harbour, which in turn will improve the attractiveness and use of our waters and shoreline.

There is a finite amount of water and land available, coupled with many competing interests. It is important that a future plan for the harbour determines the right balance among land uses – commercial/industrial marine uses, transportation, recreational, residential, institutional and environmental. The plan must also be properly aligned with all aspects of the overall Regional Plan. Halifax Harbour might significantly benefit from the formulation of an improved management structure. At present there are many players and stakeholders involved with harbour activity and harbour-front development – the three levels of government, crown corporations, landowners, non-government organizations, scientific community and others – all largely working independently of one another. An integrated structure for management, administration and decision making for harbour development would result in improved coordination, cost-effectiveness, and plan implementation leadership. Improved coordination of legislative administration regarding harbour activity and development is required. There is currently a myriad of statutes, regulations and approval processes at all three levels of government, some of which either overlap or conflict. The rationalization of these jurisdictional matters would result in more effective and efficient service delivery. Lastly, a completed Harbour Plan should include an accompanying implementation/action plan with such items as prioritization of initiatives, promotion, and capital expenditure planning. The management structure would presumably take responsibility for leading the implementation strategy.

The proposed Regional Plan will strengthen the protection of natural resources and rural resource lands. Already outlined for protection in existing community plans, these lands are important for forestry, agriculture, mining and other rural economies. The plan offers: 14 new wilderness and trail corridors, many linked into the regional trail system; reduction of greenhouse gas emissions by 10 percent; and better protection of watersheds. For example, with the proposed plan, 19 watersheds, down from 46, run the risk of being negatively impacted by development. We are also looking seriously at initiating watershed-based planning documents rather than preparing Municipal Planning Strategies based largely on political boundaries. By planning where and how we grow, we'll need approximately 5,000 hectares for new residential development, instead of the 18,000 projected if past patterns continued. This will preserve land for other needs, like forestry, agriculture, and 5 new regional parks.

The proposed Regional Plan speaks directly to coastal management and ESSIM. One of the draft environmental policies states that "HRM will encourage senior levels of government to pursue an integrated coastal management plan for Nova Scotia that will involve all coastal zone municipalities and other stakeholders in an economically and

environmentally sustainable effort to preserve our coastal communities, resources and ecosystems." When ESSIM includes coastal waters, HRM will be available as a willing participant to join the collaborative team in addressing enhanced environmental management for HRM's coastal communities, estuaries and watersheds.

MARIS: A Tool for Comprehensive Maritime Traffic and Risk Assessment

Ronald Pelot, Department of Industrial Engineering, Dalhousie University
E-Mail: Ronald.Pelot@Dal.ca

A major research project is being conducted in collaboration with several agencies, notably the Canadian Coast Guard and the Canadian National Search & Rescue Secretariat. The impetus for this research is to develop a Geographic Information System (GIS) based risk tool to aid with prevention, planning, and search and rescue resource allocation. This involves developing comprehensive databases of all maritime traffic and estimating the risks associated with each type of activity. In some cases, existing databases are cleaned and reformatted for spatial analysis (such as shipping traffic and fishing trips), whereas other vessel movements, such as those associated with aquaculture, ferries and ecotourism, have been generated by the MARIN Group.

The resulting software, MARIS (Maritime Activity & Risk Investigation System), serves as an effective instrument for maritime risk research, as well as oceans use mapping. It incorporates several features geared towards non-technical users. Entire sets of activity can be displayed in colour-coded maps; alternatively subsets can be selected according to multiple criteria such as vessel size, commodity shipped, or species fished. Aside from traffic levels, accident clusters can be portrayed, as well as the spatial distribution of probabilities or consequences of various types of incidents. Visualizations for more effective decisions can be achieved through map overlays, histogram generation for time series, and slide show exports.

This project has spawned several research thrusts to address poorly understood and under-investigated areas of maritime risk. Spatio-temporal distributions and trends in fishing activities and incidents have been conducted using a variety of techniques. Multivariate analyses have been applied to merchant traffic resulting in a set of predictor variables, which can then be applied to forecasting, simulation, and trend analyses. A host of risk factors has been explored such as vessel characteristics, distance from shore, depth of water, and numerous weather factors.

This set of tools and methodologies has been invoked for decision support in a range of circumstances. The most significant impact was gained when MARIS was applied to calculate spatial risks and response metrics to help evaluate location decisions for eight new lifeboat stations across Canada. Other applications include: traffic analyses in sensitive sea areas; support of whale protection investigations; navigable waters classification according to traffic types and volumes; hydrographic services level of service; response implications of multi-tasking vessels; and the analysis of fishery risks by region, season, year and vessel characteristics.

The Sable Island Station: A Commitment to a Long-term Human Presence

Zoe Lucas, Sable Island Researcher
E-Mail: zoelucas@greenhorsesociety.com

The Sable Island Station is the only permanently staffed facility on the Island. For many decades the Station's primary role on the Island was the collection of weather data, but during the last few decades its role has greatly expanded. The continuous human presence on Sable Island provides year-round stewardship, as well as infrastructure and expertise enabling a wide range of programs relevant to issues of sovereignty, safety, terrestrial, marine and atmospheric environment, and heritage. Without the capacity and capability provided by the Station such programs would be prohibitively expensive and, in some cases, logistically impossible, and most, if not all, would be terminated. If the Sable Island Station is closed, and the continuous human presence removed, there will be no effective conservation and protection for Sable Island, and the various support services and research and monitoring programs will end.

The conservation and management challenges of Sable Island are daunting. Given its biodiversity and cultural value, threats to its wildlife and habitats, the need for research and monitoring in support of conservation, and the expensive logistics associated with working on the island, it will always be very difficult, if considered on a project-by-project basis, to meet legislative and other commitments to protect its values. However, if ever there was an operation that should not be considered on a project-by-project basis, it is the Sable Island Station. Indeed, the strength of the Station is in the synergy of facilities and programs, which taken together produce for Canadians an ensemble of services and achievements far greater than the sum of its parts.

It costs roughly $1 million annually to operate the Sable Island Station. If the only program carried out by the Station was aerology, most would agree it would be at too high a cost. Or if the only activity enabled by the Station was protection of the nesting terns, again it would be deemed too high a cost. Or if the only service provided by the Station was refuelling for Search and Rescue helicopters, the cost would be prohibitive. Likewise, each of many other programs – horse research, the geomagnetic observatory, the aviation beacon, oiled seabird surveys etc. – when considered alone would not be worth the expense. However, when all these and the many other programs and services supported and provided by the Sable Island Station are considered together, the operation is highly cost-effective for Canada in addressing a wide range of commitments, concerns and interests.

An example of this synergy is in how the Station, by carrying out the aerology program for the Meteorological Service, is necessarily staffed year-round and consequently provides infrastructure and services that enable other research and monitoring groups to operate on Sable Island safely and efficiently. These groups in turn pay for services provided by the Station (electricity, transport, security etc.) thus contributing funding to the Station. Every program presently carried out on Sable Island benefits from this synergy. Each program enhances the efficiency of every other program. Furthermore, this synergy is evident in the Sable Island "community". The Sable Island Station is part of a community of interests and operators that includes numerous federal and provincial government departments, various universities, and the offshore energy industry.

On January 31st, 2005 the Government of Canada issued a news release announcing its intention to maintain the year-round human presence on Sable Island. Two federal departments, Environment Canada and Fisheries and Oceans (DFO), have agreed to jointly cover the shortfall of $500,000/year in order to keep the Station open until permanent funding can be arranged. The Government of Nova Scotia will also participate. As part of its contribution, DFO will provide the vessel and support for the annual re-supply. During the next two years the federal government will explore a statute change for the Island, and until then DFO will continue to have responsibility and authority for Sable Island. Beginning on April 1st, 2005 the Station on Sable Island will be managed directly by the Meteorological Service of Canada (a branch of Environment Canada) and Station staff will be government employees.

In the meantime, Environment Canada will take the lead in establishing an advisory board. The composition and mandate of this advisory board are critical. Issues and concerns associated with both Sable Island and the Station are complex, varied and occasionally divergent. Participants on the advisory board must bring to the organization a wide range of technical and scientific expertise, operational experience, institutional memory and public support. Such an advisory board, by bringing together representatives from the Sable Island community – federal and provincial government agencies, industry, university and public interest groups – would provide the expertise required to manage both the Island and the Sable Island Station.

For more information about the Sable Island Station, see http://www.GreenHorseSociety.com.

APPENDIX V: CONSOLIDATED NOTES FROM SMALL GROUPS[2]

This section contains the summaries of the small-group discussions as consolidated by the facilitators and the workshop consolidation team during the workshop.

Small-Group Discussion of Vision, Scope of the Plan, and Planning Area

1. Vision, Goal and Principles

1.1 Vision

- Lack of clarity on difference between vision for Plan and vision for ESSIM area
- Strong support for vision for area vision - outcome based
- Vision should be balanced between outcome and process
- Need to define sustainability for the vision
- Short and inspiring, but within context
- Should have a time scale
- Some thought process vision fine as is (broad and general)
- Sector visions required (need to link to overall Vision)
- Include people and place
- Who is vision for?
- Link to *Oceans Action Plan*

1.2 Goals

- Goals must reflect ecosystem limits
- Wording to be tightened up (look at goal overlap)
- 4th goal should balance national, local and regional perspectives

1.3 Principles

- Think more about principle of collaboration (e.g., capacity, conflict resolution)
- Accountability could be stand-alone principle
- Collaboration should include partnership, or partnership should be a separate principle
- Valuation as a principle - recognizing different ways of valuing (economic/social/cultural etc.)
- Too many principles - should consolidate to reduce overlap*
- Should they be prioritized?
- Should seek to identify and monitor measurable outcomes
- Are already in place in fisheries management and other groups, if followed, should be OK
- Need glossary/definitions

Include as principles:

- Science-based
- Ongoing learning
- Balance
- Adaptive*
- Fairness and equity
- Stakeholder buy-in
- Commitment to action
- Sustainable development *and use* (better definition)
- Collaboration
- Accountability
- Education

---

[2] An asterisk (*) signifies multiple group support.

2. Planning Area

2.1 Comments on Current Area

- Created before collaboration process began
- Administrative*
- Arbitrary*
- Nonsensical
- Good and should work in other areas including coastal and beyond EEZ.
- 12 nautical miles in Plan but map shows that it goes to shore
- Fisheries biased

2.2 Criteria

- Suggest include watersheds*
- Need to include/reflect LOMAs
- Suggest areas be based on historical data - highlight heavy use zones
- Suggest areas be based on historical/cultural communities to minimize conflict
- Expansion of boundary to west (may require finesse, could slow process, requires collaboration)*, and include all of Shelf
- Account for future boundaries of additional IM areas (i.e. seamless with Gulf of Maine, Gulf of St. Lawrence and Grand Banks)
- Aboriginal claims*
- Tourism (for coastal inclusions?)
- Should only go to EEZ (otherwise have to include international organizations)*.
- Based on available scientific information
- Boundaries should be flexible and adaptive*** (may shift over time with issues)
- Plan needs to be clear on process for defining final planning area

2.3 Concerns/Issues

- Real problem is management of edges of boundaries (buffer zones?)*
- 2 perspectives: 1) boundaries based primarily on ecosystem boundaries and then human use/jurisdictional boundaries, or 2) the other way around****
- Boundaries are irrelevant to some degree - most important to recognize that issues, uses, systems (natural and socio-economic) are inherently transboundary.
- Process is as important as the Plan itself
- 3 perspectives: 1) Keep it small and do it right*; 2) Should be expanded sooner rather than later (West & inshore)* and 3) Maintain offshore focus but expand to the West.
- Boundaries should reflect all use patterns
- French keyhole should be included
- Develop common boundary between GOM and ESSIM to avoid "orphaned" Western shelf

3. Structure, Scope and Content of the Plan

3.1 Overall opinion on plan

- Make more user friendly to increase public support, and to reach target audiences*
- Break down Plan into smaller sections
- Numbering system for TOC
- Interactive boxes good
- Has potential to address full range of management needs
- Sound framework
- Needs more clarity on plan designation under *Oceans Act*
- Reword term Ecosystem Management
- Enhance private sector role or focus
- Need process for including Scotia-Fundy Fisheries Roundtable as key fishing sector forum

- Support for use of action planning - opportunity to link other initiatives

3.2 What needs to be added?

- Impact of environment on human health
- Community outreach
- Brief history/background* - Examples/case studies
- Decision-making and conflict resolution
- Simplify governance structure
- Social and cultural values/objectives

3.3 Actions

- Need prioritization with clear timelines
- Clarify responsible organizations
- More information on funding and costs
- Performance indicators
- Could organize actions around IM tools.

Small-Group Discussion of Decision Rules for Integrating Human Use and Ecosystem Objectives

1. Do you agree with the use of decision rules for integrating ecosystem and human use objectives? If not, are there other ways to integrate ecosystem and human use objectives?

- it is essential to have rules****
- this is a good start - agree in general with the concept****
- did not like term "decision rules" - prefer guidelines**
- Others feel "guidelines" is too weak -- prefer rules
- too early in the process to start developing rules ---> develop objectives further
- rules are fine but they require transparency, accountability and adaptive to time variations
- streamlining -- don't duplicate existing process
- concern about ecosystem vs. human use
- need clarification

2. How do the decision rules contained in the plan look to you? How can they be improved? Are there additional decision rules that should be included?

- Who decides? who makes the decisions?***** (or enforces)
- need more definitions of terms --"e.g., carrying capacity"*******
- "preference", "compatibility", "significant", "assimilative", "footprint", "environmentally sound", "contaminant" (incl. ballast, propeller noise)
- replace "ocean" with "marine ecosystem"
- replace the words "harvesting" and "extraction" with "use"
- need rules for resolving human use conflict (human use vs. human use) (socio-economic)******* (address human use on its own)
- need to expand on the conflict resolution process
- manage conflict at the lowest level possible - also be aware of conflict location -- inter or intra
- priorities in decision rules need adjustment*
    - biodiversity (paramount)** (include species at risk)
- need better balance -- higher priority for human use**
- rules seem to put ecosystem first - check against principles that indicate all are equal
- need to be more explicit**
- need to develop detail -- reference levels/tolerances
- incorporate precautionary approach*
- need additional rule for cumulative impacts, examples if possible
- decision rule implementation requires good science (which we don't have now)
- decision rules need to be seen in a regional context

- order rules from general to specific
- need to clarify the relationship between these rules and others that already exist -- will these "trump" others?
- need clarification -- are rules for integrating objectives or for making decision?
- clarify between principles, guidelines and rules
- should be target or goal based -- not just rules
- will decision rules include compensation??
- incorporate consideration of mitigation not just prohibition ... allow for best practices, new technology, alternatives, identify opportunities
- more information is required on future decisions
- this is a crucial stage -- get professional advice
- give preferences to proponents that develop or use "best practices" or "best available technology" to reduce impacts
- contaminants rule should be more front end
- learn from and align with environmental assessment
- connection between rights and rules needs to be explained
- expand scope to include "harming"
- a number of comments were received about wording of specific rules.

Small-Group Discussion on the Collaborative Planning Model

1. **General**
   - Not perfect, but a good start - generally considered to be sound****
   - Need for transparency
   - Too complicated - related to the inclusivity
   - Needs a sense of shared responsibility
   - Positive - opportunities for stakeholders to talk
   - Too many layers, too many government reps
   - Too bureaucratic
   - Need more detail on Terms of Reference
   - Need to be flexible*
   - Needs to be credible in order to receive support (e.g., financial; resources)
   - Needs goals and timelines (see action plans)
   - Inclusiveness/participatory process good***
   - Positive - DFO sharing decision-making mandate
   - Resources required for stakeholders to participate*
   - All partners and participants need to be committed**
   - Important that DFO headquarters should be involved
   - Decision makers should attend and be engaged
   - Need to show links between parts (model, chart,??)
   - Clarify decision roles
   - Clarify enforcement component*
   - Information flow needs to be continuous - several media to be used to reach all groups
   - Make info accessible to public (especially government meetings)
   - Need to recognize existing institutions*
   - Can it move forward without full participation?
   - Decision-making roles clarified**
   - Need user-friendly language
   - Link to users outside area
   - Change can be a challenge
   - Need State of ESSIM Report
   - Monitor process
   - Promotes discussion of broader issues

- Separate CP Model from the IM Plan and put planning process objectives in an Appendix

1.1 Representation

- Women's groups omitted
- Government participation in SRT
- Missing ecotourism
- Municipal reps
- Need criteria for defining stakeholder
- Representation of sectors is a strength because it allows identification of common ground
- Aboriginal participation
- Should politicians be involved?

2. Federal-Provincial Working Group

- Need municipal representation

3. RCOM

- Concerns about senior official buy in**
- Role requires clarification
- Must be clear that they cannot change stakeholder recommendations, only endorse or seek further work
- If RCOM is regional, how will provinces be incorporated?
- Where does RCOM fit with similar layers?
- Need formalized commitment for power sharing and resource sharing

4. Stakeholder Roundtable

- Needs more teeth - needs to be stronger to make sure recommendations are implemented*
- How do recommendations of SRT go to RCOM?
- Will participation/composition adapt to issues being addressed?
- Concerns with government participation in SRT (regulators)
- Concerns about capacity and resources needed to support implementation
- Define community
- Clarify mandate. Is role general feedback or direct recommendations?
- Concern that SRT will undermine existing processes or cause burnout
- Fishing industry - funding for participation*
- Support stakeholders that are not supported by a specific sector
- Clarify communication mechanism between SRT reps and their sectors
- Suggest elected representation on SRT
- Too big
- Observers and alternates should be allowed to attend
- Fed-Prov representatives should be included
- Reps should be accountable for their performance
- Secret ballot if no consensus (?)
- Stakeholders have a responsibility to ensure representation
- Important to get right mix
- Consider sunset clause
- Roundtable should feed back to Forum
- Forum builds vision, SRT delivers
- SRT could break into small working groups - provide opportunities for discussion away from government

4.1 Specific Challenges

- Capacity - risk of burnout**
- Getting good representation - wide diversity within some sectors may be a challenge******
- Sectors may fear being under-represented or buried in SRT (in cases where non-consensus)
- Building capacity so can participate in a meaningful way - look at other models for capacity building.

- Challenge for fishing industry and others - time consuming, lots of meetings***
- Need to convince industry and other stakeholders that it is good for them to participate*
- Need for consolidation of industry groups
- Clarify purpose/selection of Member at Large*
- ESSIM not a priority for some
- Ensure continuity if membership rotates
- Use working groups/experts for task work
- SRT should link to RCOM and Roundtable report
- Government reps need support and empowerment

5. **Planning Office**
   - Need a community map to determine key players
   - Recognized critical role of planning office and resourcing***
   - Planning Office is a strength
   - Public education is important - locally focused outreach**
   - Think about knowledge transfer
   - Consider inter-departmental involvement and other participants***
   - Need to show progress on short-term goals

6. **ESSIM Forum**
   - Need natural and social science support - also TEK
   - Utilize full forum, not just reps
   - Forum delegates tasks (to SRT)

Small-Group Discussion on Action Planning

1.1 In general, how do the strategies and actions look?

- Levels of detail vary across the strategies and actions. Ecosystem conservation strategies and actions are more specific than those for multiple human use. **
- Actions should be prioritized.*** Use a matrix of Human Use / Ecosystem objective interactions to identify priorities.
- Implementation approach may vary depending on proposed use or users.
- Clear links to the objectives in the plan are important.
- This section of the plan is very dense.
- Resources (e.g., financial, human, data) will be essential for implementation. Allocating resources requires commitment.**
- Clarify connection between actions/strategies and larger collaborative planning framework (i.e., who does what?). Need to be clear about roles and linkages.*
- Strategies and actions should focus on all sectors equally (avoid DFO focus).
- Will need to move from broad issues to specifics.
- Uniform rules for all users are essential.
- A clear workplan is important.
- Try to avoid duplication of actions by multiple parties.

1.2 Are there strategies or actions that should be added, removed or changed?

- The document should include specific strategies for pursuing human use objectives. *
- A strategy for community and economic well-being should be included.
- There should be strategies to address impacts of ecosystems on human health (e.g., red tide).
- Add the following strategy: "encourage local initiatives that are compatible with overall ESSIM Framework."
- Make Strategy 13 Action 3.1 short term and more action oriented.
- Strategy 2 should be worded "reduce conflict" rather than "avoid."

Question 2: Format and Organization

- The tabular format is useful for compiling and presenting a large amount of information.
- Tables are well organized. ***
- The three themes (multiple use, conservation, and collaborative planning) are confusing.
- The last three columns could be improved. "Relevant sectors" and "all sectors" should be clarified.
- Suggestion: organize by short, medium, and long term actions**, or by lead party.
- Having lead organizations identified is useful *
- Suggestion: list affected sectors hierarchically.
- Summarize strategies at the beginning of the table.
- Include timelines with intended start date and completion date for all actions*
- Links should be drawn to other initiatives in a flow chart (e.g., links to RAP or species at risk program).*
- Some actions can be combined.*
- Links between actions and with other objectives and strategies need to be clearly illustrated.*
- Clarify terminology. "Underway" is too unspecific; "percent complete" would be more useful. Also clarify short, medium, long term, initiated, etc.
- Resources required for each strategy should be identified.

Question 3: Use of short-term action plans as an implementation mechanism.

- Clarify role of SRT with respect to action planning.
- Action plans are a good way to start out and support implementation. *****
- All sectors should be engaged in action planning process.
- Harmonize with existing stakeholder processes where possible (i.e., avoid duplication).
- Suggestion: Have a comprehensive but adaptive 5yr plan that can be modified annually.
- Suggestion: yearly reporting, posted online.
- Plan life span should be indefinite with 5yr reviews and 1-2-3 yr actions.
- Need commitment beyond 5yrs.
- Use a business plan approach, with performance reviews and indicators.*

Question 4: Key Actions for the Next 12 Months

- Popularize documents and conduct active outreach to engage stakeholders / community.*
- Link to Oceans Action Plan.
- Do something tangible to generate confidence and create momentum. Move forward.**
- Demonstrate benefits from ESSIM within 3-5yrs. Celebrate, and communicate success.*
- Include coastal zone.
- Finalize and move ahead with collaborative planning model. Develop SRT.*
- Interim SRT should be established soon. Get more input from stakeholders before establishing permanent SRT.
- Incorporate conflict negotiation document into collaborative planning model.
- Use coral plan to test SRT.
- Prioritize ecosystem research requirements.
- Confirm boundaries of planning area.
- Identify priority actions.
- Start with actions A1-A4
- Priority Actions: S1 A1, S2 A1, S2 A1.1, S2 A4, S3 A1, S3 A3, S4 A1, S5 A1.
- Apply ecosystem objectives to all ocean users.
- Continue work on zoning and MPAs.
- Present revised plan to stakeholders, get approval, and integrate feedback.
- Conduct critical path analysis.

APPENDIX VI: ESSIM-RELATED PUBLICATIONS

This appendix contains a list of key references and documents for the ESSIM Initiative. The documents listed below and additional background information can be obtained from the ESSIM Initiative website (http://www.mar.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/oceans/e/essim/essim-intro-e.html) or by contacting the ESSIM Planning Office.

ESSIM PLANNING OFFICE DOCUMENTS

The Development of a Collaborative Management and Planning Process: A Discussion Paper prepared for the Federal-Provincial ESSIM Working Group (2001).

Issues, Challenges and Opportunities: A Discussion Paper prepared for the Federal-Provincial ESSIM Working Group (2001).

An International Survey of Integrated Ocean and Coastal Planning Initiatives (2001).

A Strategic Planning Framework for the Eastern Scotian Shelf Ocean Management Plan: A Discussion Paper prepared for the ESSIM Forum (2003).

Oceans and Coastal Management Report 2004-01. *Developing Objectives and Indicators for Marine Ecosystem-Based Management: International Review of Marine Ecosystem-Based Management Initiatives throughout the World* (prepared by Jay Walmsley, Jacques Whitford Environment Ltd.).

Oceans and Coastal Management Report 2004-02. *Developing Objectives and Indicators for Marine Ecosystem-Based Management: Definition of Commonly Used Terms* (prepared by Jay Walmsley, Jacques Whitford Environment Ltd.).

Oceans and Coastal Management Report 2004-03. *International Review of Areas where Activities are Restricted to Protect Deep Sea Corals* (prepared by D'Entremont Environmental Ltd.).

Oceans and Coastal Management Report 2004-04. *Review of Criteria for Selecting Ecologically Significant Areas of the Scotian Shelf and Slope: A Discussion Paper* (prepared by Heather Breeze, Maris Consulting).

Oceans and Coastal Management Report 2004-05. *Eastern Scotian Shelf Integrated Management (ESSIM) Initiative: Proposed Collaborative Planning Model – A Discussion Paper* (prepared by BLSmith Groupwork Inc.).

Oceans and Coastal Management Report 2005-01. *Report of the Eastern Scotian Shelf Integrated Management Community Workshops.*

Oceans and Coastal Management Report 2005-03. *Human Use Objectives and Indicators Framework for Integrated Management on the Scotian Shelf* (prepared by Jay Walmsley, Jacques Whitford Environment Ltd.).

Oceans and Coastal Management Report 2005-05. *Conflict, Collaboration and Consensus in the Eastern Scotian Shelf Integrated Management (ESSIM) Initiative* (prepared by BLSmith Groupwork Inc.).

ESSIM-RELATED DFO DOCUMENTS

Below is a selection of ESSIM-related documents available through DFO's Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat (CSAS) and the Canadian Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences report series.

Proceedings Series

R. O'Boyle (ed.). 2000. *Proceedings of a Workshop on the Ecosystem Considerations for the Eastern Scotian Shelf Integrated Management (ESSIM) Area.* CSAS Proceedings Series 2000/014.

G. Jamieson and R. O'Boyle (eds.). 2001. *Proceedings of the National Workshop on Objectives and Indicators for Ecosystem-based Management.* CSAS Proceedings Series 2001/009.

J. Arbour (chair) and V. Kostylev (ed.). 2002. *Proceedings of a Benthic Habitat Classification Workshop Meeting of the Maritimes Regional Advisory Process. A Framework for the Conservation of Benthic Communities of the Scotia-Fundy Area of the Maritimes Region.* CSAS Proceedings Series 2002/023.

R. O'Boyle and P. Keizer. 2003. *Proceedings of three workshops to investigate the unpacking process in support of ecosystem-based management; February – July, 2002.* CSAS Proceedings Series 2003/004.

J. Arbour (chair) and R. St-Laurent (compiler). 2004. *Proceedings of a Benthic Habitat Classification Workshop Meeting of the Maritimes Regional Advisory Process. Benthic Classification and Usage Guidelines of the Scotia-Fundy Area of the Maritimes Region.* CSAS Proceedings Series 2004/004.

H. Powles, V. Vendette, R. Siron and R. O'Boyle. 2004. *Proceedings of the Canadian Marine Ecoregions Workshop.* CSAS Proceedings Series 2004/016.

Habitat and Ecosystem Status Reports

DFO Maritimes Region. 2003. *State of the Eastern Scotian Shelf Ecosystem.* CSAS Ecosystem Status Report 2003/04.

DFO National Capital Region. 2004. *Habitat Status Report on Ecosystem Objectives.* CSAS Habitat Status Report 2004/01.

DFO National Capital Region. 2004. *Identification of Ecologically and Biologically Significant Areas.* CSAS Ecosystem Status Report 2004/006.

Research Documents

S. Coffen-Smout, R.G. Halliday, G. Herbert, T. Potter, and N. Witherspoon. 2001. *Ocean Activities and Ecosystem Issues on the Eastern Scotian Shelf: An Assessment of Current Capabilities to Address Ecosystem Objectives.* CSAS Research Document 2001/095.

R. O'Boyle, M. Sinclair, P. Keizer, K. Lee, D. Ricard and P. Yeats. 2004. *Operationalizing an Ecosystem Conservation Framework for the Eastern Scotian Shelf.* CSAS Research Document 2004/076.

Technical and Manuscript Reports

P.L. Stewart and L. White. 2001. *A Review of Contaminants on the Scotian Shelf and in Adjacent Coastal Waters: 1970 to 1995.* Can. Tech. Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 2351: xviii + 158 pp.

S. Coffen-Smout, G. Herbert, R.J. Rutherford and B.L. Smith (eds.). 2002. *Proceedings of the 1st Eastern Scotian Shelf Integrated Management (ESSIM) Forum Workshop, Halifax, Nova Scotia, 20-21 February 2002.* Can. Manuscr. Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 2604: xiii + 63 pp.

H. Breeze, D.G. Fenton, R.J. Rutherford, and M.A. Silva. 2002. *The Scotian Shelf: An ecological overview for ocean planning.* Can. Tech. Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 2393: x + 259 pp.

R.J. Rutherford, S. Coffen-Smout, G. Herbert and B.L. Smith (eds.). 2003. *Proceedings of the 2nd Eastern Scotian Shelf Integrated Management (ESSIM) Forum Workshop, Halifax, Nova Scotia, 18-19 February 2003.* Can. Manuscr. Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 2637: x + 63 pp.

G. Chao, G. Herbert, S. Coffen-Smout, and H. Breeze. 2004. *Overview of Federal, Provincial, and International Ocean Regulatory and Policy Frameworks on the Scotian Shelf.* Can. Tech. Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 2513: 231 pp.